



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2015

No. 64

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 30, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. CARTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IT IS TIME TO STOP STALLING ON THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, a looming deadline, the highway trust fund extension expires. I actually could have dusted off the speech I gave last summer, arguing against this ill-advised measure to slide it into this spring.

As I pointed out then, we will be right back in the same spot. We will be stuck. We won't have a long-term pro-

posal. We won't have a short-term proposal. We will look at another extension.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to stop the stalling. Everyone ought to make a commitment that this will be the last extension that we take before we give America what it needs, a robust 6-year reauthorization of the critical highway trust fund.

Please focus on making sure this does not slide beyond the end of this Federal fiscal year because Congress doesn't act absent some sort of deadline, and do instead what we do best: stall, study, and sidestep.

If we would actually start working now, the 5 months until the expiration of this Federal fiscal year, we can actually give the people legislation they deserve. It is not that hard; except if you never start, if you don't know how big the program is going to be, if you don't get down to business, it is difficult.

Now, I hear that the simplest approach, the most direct approach—raising the gas tax for the first time in 22 years—is somehow too hard, too difficult for Congress. It has been pronounced dead on arrival. It is off the table, according to our distinguished majority leader and the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Why exactly is it off the table? Why is this too hard for Congress? If it was good enough for Dwight Eisenhower to start the Interstate Highway System, if it was good enough for Ronald Reagan to call Congress to come back during his Thanksgiving Day speech, November 29, 1982, to more than double the gas tax, if it is good enough for 19 States—including, this year, five Republican States—to raise the gas tax, why is it too hard for us? Maybe it is because we have never given the people who care deeply about this a chance to make their case.

The Republicans have been in charge for 52 months. We have not had a single hearing on Ways and Means on trans-

portation finance. What if we allowed the Chamber of Commerce, the AFL-CIO, the American Trucking Association, contractors, local governments, engineers, environmentalists, mayors to come in and make the case why they support raising the gas tax?

Maybe if Congress did its job, if it listened to the people, if it allowed the broadest coalition you have seen on Capitol Hill on any major idea to come in, take a couple days, work with Congress, explain the issues, dive into the details, actually show politicians that even the public supports it, maybe we could do our job, maybe we could have a 6-year reauthorization, maybe we could put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs all across America, making our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

Deadline, September 30—get down to work; have some hearings; do our job; produce the bill, and America will be better off.

SALUTING LAW ENFORCEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a matter that is, frankly, getting out of hand. It is more than a matter; it is a problem. This is a problem that has expanded beyond the borders of individual American cities and into the international spotlight. It is a problem that is no longer a localized issue, but a national one that is spiraling out of control.

This week, we watched in horror as Baltimore burned. We watched in disgust as lowlifes destroyed their own communities as local government helplessly stood by. We watched in anger that some could even think to justify this sort of behavior. I applaud President Obama for calling those responsible for the destruction who they really are, criminals and thugs.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2659

Mr. Speaker, everyone has the right to participate in peaceful demonstrations, and I thank and respect those in Baltimore who exercised their constitutionally granted right, but, when the actions of a few infringe on the rights of others, we have a problem. When the actions of a few violent protesters dominate the 24-hour news cycle, it takes away from the importance of the message, and it tears apart already fragile communities.

When businesses are trashed, those responsible must be brought to justice. When a national chain pharmacy is set aflame, we ask if they will ever risk doing business in that community ever again.

As a businessowner, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it would take a whole lot of convincing to get me to invest my sweat, energy, and treasure in a city that has demonstrated the type of lawlessness we have seen in recent days, and that is a tragedy. It is a tragedy because these communities so desperately need structure, stability, support, and jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is law enforcement that will help reassure businesses that they will be able to safely operate in these communities. It is law enforcement that will reduce the risk that is currently holding back job creators from setting up shop. Mr. Speaker, communities must have law and order to succeed and prosper. I applaud those in law enforcement who have worked so hard to ensure that.

In God we trust.

PUT A WOMAN ON THE TWENTY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, what would it be like if the Chamber and this government reflected the diversity of the American people? There would be a lot more portraits of women alongside all the portraits of committee chairmen of the past decades.

In 2015, it wouldn't be newsworthy when a competent, intelligent person who happens to be African American is hired for a job for which she is supremely qualified, which happened this week when Loretta Lynch was sworn in as our 83rd Attorney General. We wouldn't still be talking about unequal pay for equal work.

I believe that, if there is a country that truly believes in equality, that it is time to put our money where our mouths are, literally, and express that sense of justice on the most widely used currency in international transaction.

Last week, I introduced the Put a Woman on the Twenty Act to build on the grassroots campaign known as Women on 20s, working to bring gender equality to our currency. Their public campaign has garnered more than half a million votes in support of putting a woman on a \$20 bill. I loved the idea,

and it was brought to me by a smart, young woman on my staff, Kate Johnson. To me, this isn't just a women's issue; it is an American issue.

My bill simply directs the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to solicit recommendations from the public for a woman to be placed on the \$20 bill. Women have inspired generations of Americans for their courage by challenging this Nation to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

Women have advocated for voting rights and equal protection under the law and for programs that serve the most vulnerable members of our communities. Women led us out of slavery on the Underground Railroad, taught us what the phrase "all men are created equal" really means by fighting for women's suffrage and civil rights and have led in all sectors in society.

When I go to the bank, when I use an ATM, when I travel overseas, the \$20 bill is already widely used and in the purses and wallets of hundreds of millions of Americans. We all know that the almighty dollar speaks; but what if it had a woman's voice?

Consider for a moment the powerful message that would be sent to a young girl in Chicago if she saw a portrait celebrating Rosa Parks or Harriet Tubman when she reached into her wallet to make a purchase. What about the young man in a country far away who maybe is still hearing damaging messages about the role of women in his country?

The portrait of Wilma Mankiller or Eleanor Roosevelt on the United States bill that represents power and success to him provides a new opportunity to show our common values about equality and inclusion in faraway places.

The organization Women on 20s has put forward four exceptional female leaders for this honor: Rosa Parks, Wilma Mankiller, Harriet Tubman, and Eleanor Roosevelt. That is a great list, but there is no reason to stop there. The initiative has sparked conversations about the many great women who have contributed in significant ways to strengthening our Nation.

I have certainly benefited from the passionate advocacy of women who have fought for civil rights and equality, as have my daughters and constituents in Chicago, many of whom are debating and weighing in on the candidates for this incredible honor.

Roosevelt University in Chicago has launched a campuswide campaign to champion Eleanor Roosevelt for the honor and not just because they were named after her. As a result of the campaign, students are participating in a national dialogue about her work advocating for child labor laws to protect kids and all workers from unsafe conditions and long hours, for gender equality, and safe housing.

Now, I don't know who will be chosen. She could be one of the women suggested already or any one of many other talented, impressive women in

our country's history. My mother, who is an amazing woman, would probably get my personal vote, but she is out of the running because, thankfully, she is still alive.

I believe the time has come to have our currency represent the contributions of women throughout our history. A woman's place is in the boardroom, chairing the committee, in the laboratory, in the Oval Office, and, yes, even on our currency.

□ 1015

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is said that, when the plan for the ancient city of Alexandria was presented to the great Alexander, his master builder pointed with pride to an ingenious way to honor the city's namesake. All of the city's water supply would be channeled to one great central fountain featuring a giant statue of Alexander and then flow from it to the surrounding city.

When Alexander seemed unimpressed, his architect explained the symbolism. Water, the life's blood of the city, would flow from Alexander to Alexandria. Alexander replied, "But water is not the life's blood of a city. Commerce is the life's blood of a city." The statue of Alexander was placed, instead, at the entrance to the port.

As it is with city-states, it is with nation-states. Every nation that engages in trade prospers from it; every nation that fails to trade, fails to prosper.

Today, international trade agreements are the means by which nations establish the terms of their commerce. This often requires intricate negotiations with trading partners, and our trading partners must be confident that the United States is bargaining in good faith and that what is decided at the bargaining table will not be revoked or redefined later at a congressional table.

The Constitution gives Congress the authority to regulate commerce with other nations. Congress, thus, has the final say over any trade agreement, but trading partners have to have confidence that, once the agreement has been reached, it represents the last best offer of both sides, a meeting of the minds that won't be repeatedly altered after the fact.

That is why, since the 1930s, Congress has chosen to exercise its responsibility by establishing the broad terms of the agreement that it seeks and then giving explicit instructions to our negotiators at the beginning of the process. If—and only if—these objectives are advanced in the agreement, Congress will then consider it as a whole package and either approve it or reject it.

That process is called trade promotion authority. It stood the test of time. It has been used to the great benefit of our Nation in the past and has never been controversial until now.

From the left, opposition comes from protectionist special interests. They fail to learn from the painful lessons of history. Protectionism is the fastest way to destroy an economy, as this Nation has learned repeatedly, including during the Jefferson administration and, again, in the Hoover administration.

From the right, opposition comes from a mistrust of this President's judgment and competence, a mistrust I completely and unequivocally share. It is precisely because of this mistrust that the trade promotion authority sets forth some 150 objectives that must be advanced before Congress will even consider the resulting agreement. Once those objectives are attained, a majority of the Congress must still approve it.

This measure does not empower the President to do his own thing; it binds the President to faithfully execute the will of Congress. Trade promotion authority simply continues a time-proven process through which Congress exercises its authority to regulate commerce at the beginning of negotiations so trading partners can have a reasonable expectation that their painstaking negotiations, compromises, and concessions won't be ripped asunder and reopened when Congress acts.

Indeed, the successful Base Closure and Realignment Commission process worked on exactly the same principle.

Let me repeat, this gives the President no new authority. It binds him to Congress' will at the outset of negotiations and promises only that, if the objectives set by Congress are advanced, will the Congress agree, not necessarily to approve the agreement, but simply to vote on it without opening new issues or causing unnecessary delays.

The statue at one of our greatest ports is not of a person, but of an ideal, liberty. It is freedom that produces prosperity, the free exchange of goods between people for their mutual betterment—the greater the freedom, the greater the prosperity. Trade promotion authority is the means by which this freedom is advanced among nations.

Mr. Speaker, freedom works. It is time that we put it back to work.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE PEOPLE OF NEPAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, along with a good many of my colleagues, are on a mission of mercy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a circumstance that has impacted the people of Nepal. A 7.8 magnitude earthquake has hit this country. It happened on April 25. More than 5,000 people have lost their

lives; 10,000 have been injured; 2.8 million people are displaced, and 8 million people have been affected. Four Americans are confirmed dead.

There is a little bit of good news. The United States of America has committed \$12.5 million in relief for the country of Nepal, but that is not enough. I believe we can do more because \$415 million will be needed for humanitarian purposes alone, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud to say that a good many organizations are pitching in. One such organization is in my district in Houston, Texas, the Nepalese Association of Houston. The chairperson and president of that association, Mr. Ghimirey, has called a meeting; and I was honored to be in attendance, along with the secretary Mr. Nepal, and about 100 or more other people.

They are doing what they can to make sure they do their share to help in this time of need, and I want you to know that we in the Congress want to make sure that we do our share to help in this time of need.

Yesterday, we heard from the Prime Minister of Japan. One of the things that he said that stuck in my mind is that America provides hope for the world. America is emblematic of hope for people who are hopeless, help for those who are helpless.

America is always there for the rest of the world. We cannot allow this situation to become anything less than what America has always been for the rest of the world.

To have the hope that they need, help has to be on the way. There has to be the help that can engender the hope that people so desperately need. To give them the hope they need, there is a bill that we have filed in the Congress of the United States of America, H.R. 2033.

This bill provides temporary protected status for the people of Nepal who happen to be in the United States of America under a legal status. If they are here legally, they will be allowed to stay for an additional 18 months. They won't be sent back to harm's way in a time of crisis.

This is what America can do. This is to provide hope. By providing help and allowing those people to stay in this country, they can continue to work. They can continue to send money home. We have found from our research that \$248 million in remittances were sent to Nepal in 2014. That is \$248 million.

We need to allow the Nepalese people to continue to work in this country and send that money back to their countrymen and women. America can do this. This is not a heavy lift. This is not immigration reform. This is something that we have done before.

We did it in 1998, under the Clinton administration, for the people of Montserrat after the volcanic eruption. We did it in 1998, under the Clinton administration, for the people of Honduras and Nicaragua after the hurri-

cane. We did it in 2001, under the Bush administration, for the people of El Salvador after two earthquakes. We did it in 2010, under the Obama administration, for the people of Haiti after a 7.0 magnitude earthquake. We can do it for the people of Nepal.

This is not a heavy lift. It does not give anyone any kind of permanent immigration status. It does not change the law as it relates to immigration. It only says we will do what we can to help people acquire the hope that they need by allowing people here to continue to work, send money back to their home country, and not put them back there in harm's way, having to live in the circumstances that might be detrimental to them.

The United States has sent in many relief teams. These relief teams are bringing with them some temporary housing, which is important; this is important, but the real hope that we can help provide would be to pass H.R. 2033, so that people who are here can continue to stay.

THOMAS FRANK JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of an important man of America's Greatest Generation, Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson. He faced life's challenges head on, and, throughout all of this vast change, he always saw America's promise above all else.

Dr. Johnson, a military veteran and influential economist, passed away last December at the age of 94 and was recently buried at Arlington National Cemetery. He served as a lieutenant commander in the Navy in the Pacific from 1943 to 1945 and remained in the Navy Reserve until 1980.

He was born September 27, 1920, in Lynchburg, Virginia, and was a child of the Great Depression, which affected his economic and personal outlook. His philosophy was simple—as he would tell his children—time marches on, so must we.

Dr. Johnson was extremely proud of his military service. However, as a humble man, he only displayed one picture of himself, on his patrol craft 1191 in the Pacific, escorting aircraft carriers and destroyers into battle. After the war, he remained in the Navy, traveling by train, bringing soldiers and sailors home—some to their families, some to hospitals, and some to their final resting places.

While very proud of his service, he rarely ever spoke of his time there. He simply moved on to the next phase of his life in post-World War II America. After concluding Active Duty, Dr. Johnson completed studies in economics at the University of Virginia and was a member of the Thomas Jefferson Society.

He moved to Washington, D.C., in 1949 and began his professional career

at the Department of Agriculture, specializing in the sugar beet industry, followed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In the mid-1950s, he served as the assistant commissioner of the Federal Housing Authority, in charge of research and legislation. He concluded his tenure at the Federal Housing Authority as acting commissioner. He then joined the American Enterprise Institute, where he influenced economic thought and public policy for another three decades.

For those three decades, Dr. Johnson held senior leadership roles at the American Enterprise Institute, including director of economic policy studies. In his last year, he was the acting CEO.

A man who did not seek the limelight, he had an uncanny ability to recruit and cultivate the foremost economic thinkers of our Nation. Dr. Johnson fostered the talent of at least three Nobel Prize winners in economics, including Milton Friedman, Jim Buchanan, and Gary Becker.

Dr. Johnson influenced economic policy during seven Presidential administrations. He established a lunchtime forum for informal discussions with Cabinet Secretaries, financial leaders, and ambassadors. Even President George H.W. Bush would attend the forum.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johnson was a humble and very forward-looking man. While engaging with many world leaders and policymakers, he was always a very private person, seldom talking about himself. He also taught economics nearly his entire professional life at the University of Virginia, George Mason University, and George Washington University.

Throughout his career, Dr. Johnson was active in professional societies such as the National Association of Business Economists, serving as chapter president in 1971; Institute for Social Science Research; Royal Economic Society; National Tax Association; American Finance Association; Southern Economic Association; and the Cosmos Club here in Washington, where he often took his children to meet important policymakers and leading economists of the Nation and the world.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Johnson was also deeply engaged in his local community, serving on the Alexandria Hospital board of directors, including a term as its president. He also proudly served on the Alexandria school board and the vestry for St. Paul's Episcopal Church and Immanuel Church-on-the-Hill Episcopal Church in Alexandria.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with his wife of 63 years, Margaret Ann; three children, Thomas, William, and the Reverend Sarah Nelson; and seven grandchildren.

Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson will surely be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD an additional account of Dr. Johnson's life.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of an important man in

American life. Dr. Thomas Frank Johnson was part of the "Greatest Generation", a time now referred to as the "American Century". He, like other nonagenarians, saw so much change during his life and faced life's challenges head on. He witnessed a World War, a dozen presidents, the beginnings of commercial aviation and lunar landings, the construction and collapse of the Berlin Wall, the rise of China and India as world powers and other wonders. Throughout all of this vast change, he always saw above all else, America's promise.

We commend Dr. Johnson—an influential economist shaping this nation's public policy and a veteran—who died December 28, 2014, at 94 years of age. He served as a Lt. Commander in the Navy in the Pacific from 1943 to 1945. He remained in the Navy Reserve until 1980.

For nearly 30 years, Dr. Johnson held senior leadership roles at the American Enterprise Institute (1958–87), including director of economic policy studies and in his last year Acting CEO. A man who did not seek the limelight, he had an uncanny ability to recruit and cultivate the foremost economic thinkers. Dr. Johnson mentored numerous AEI scholars—providing the ideas and discourse—and then editing the publications of the nation's pre-eminent economists and public policy planners including Jean Kirkpatrick, Carla Hills, Irving Krystal, Herb Stein, and Murray Wiedenbaum. Dr. Johnson fostered the talent of at least three Nobel Prize winners in Economics including Milton Friedman, Jim Buchanan, and Gary Becker—well-known members of the Chicago School of Economic Thought. Because of Dr. Johnson's guidance and mentoring, other colleagues and assistants have also gone onto remarkable careers.

Dr. Johnson was known as the "Dean of AEI" and influenced economic policy during seven presidential administrations—John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard M. Nixon, Gerald R. Ford, Ronald W. Reagan and George H.W. Bush. Dr. Johnson established the AEI cafeteria, a lunchtime forum for informal discussions with cabinet secretaries, financial leaders, and ambassadors. George Herbert Walker Bush was a regular.

Dr. Johnson published numerous articles of his own in professional journals and books such as *Renewing America's Cities*. He served on the commission for urban renewal under three Virginia Governors—Linwood Holton, Miles Godwin and Bob Dalton. In 1980, Virginia enacted a law that implemented most of commission's work with a \$150 million appropriation—an enormous sum at the time—to renew Virginia's cities.

He was a humble and very forward-looking man. While engaging with many world leaders and policymakers, he was always a very private person seldom talking about himself. He mused why anyone would want to know about his past. He and his generation just didn't boast—they just faced life every day and moved into the future.

Over 94 years, Dr. Johnson achieved significant professional, community, and personal accomplishments. He was born Sept 27, 1920, in Lynchburg, Virginia, and was a child of the Great Depression which affected his economic and personnel outlook. His family had several reversals of fortune, including the loss of their tobacco farm near Farmville, Virginia. As a result, he didn't believe in debt and paid cash

for everything, including his home. His philosophy was simple. As he would tell his children, "time marches on, so must we."

Dr. Johnson was extremely proud of his military service to our nation. However, as a humble man, he only displayed one picture of himself—on his "Patrol Craft 1191" in the Pacific escorting aircraft carriers and destroyers into battle. After the war, he remained in the U.S. Navy travelling by train bringing soldiers and sailors home: some to their families; some to hospitals; and some to their final resting places. While very proud of his service, he rarely ever spoke of that time. He simply moved onto his next Phase—the post World War II America.

His generation witnessed terrible tragedies and atrocities. Because of these experiences, Dr. Johnson respected people of all origins recognizing their fate could have easily been his. He often told his children about friends and colleagues who experienced incredible war-time escapes and journeys from Eastern Europe and Asia to America. He helped many of these immigrants, refugees go onto successful lives in the United States. These harrowing experiences are why he never lost sight of America's promise.

After concluding active duty, Dr. Johnson completed studies in economics at the University of Virginia (B.A. 1943, M.A. 1947, and Ph.D. 1949) and was a member of the Thomas Jefferson Society. He also attended Lynchburg College (1939–41).

Dr. Johnson moved to Washington, D.C. in 1949 and began his professional career at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (1949–51)—specializing in the sugar industry—followed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (1951–54). In the mid-1950s, he served as Assistant Commissioner of the Federal Housing Authority (1954–58) in charge of research and legislation during the implementation of the urban renewal provisions of the National Housing Act of 1954. He concluded his tenure at the Federal Housing Authority as Acting Commissioner. This was a time of incredible American renewal in which he played such an important role in shaping. He then joined AEI where he influenced economic thought and public policy for another three decades.

Dr. Johnson taught economics nearly his entire professional life at the University of Virginia, George Mason University, and George Washington University. He also lectured at dozens of campuses throughout the country. He was responsible for bringing scholars to George Mason and helping to establish its economics and law schools.

Throughout his career, Dr. Johnson was active in professional societies such as the National Association of Business Economists, serving as chapter president in 1971, Institute for Social Science Research, Royal Economic Society (U.K.), National Tax Association, American Finance Association and the Cosmos Club in Washington, D.C., where he often took his children to meet important policymakers and leading economists.

Dr. Johnson was also deeply engaged in the local community serving on the Alexandria Hospital Board of Directors from 1965 to 1971, including a term as its president (1970–1971). As a patient, he never mentioned his leadership on the hospital board—even when getting a new pacemaker on his 90 birthday! He also proudly served on the Alexandria School Board (1974–1976) and the vestry for St.

Paul's Episcopal Church and Emmanuel Church on the Hill Episcopal Church in Alexandria.

As we remember Dr. Johnson, with his family present today in the Well of the House Chamber, it was this humble member of the Greatest Generation and his contributions that made the American Century possible. He is survived by his wife of 63 years Margaret Ann (Emhardt); three children Thomas Emhardt (Julianne Mueller), William Harrison (Tracy Schario), and the Rev. Sarah Nelson; and seven grandchildren—Gaelen, Caleb, Eliza, Keegan, and Maren Nelson and Natalie and Garret Johnson.

We owe Dr. Johnson and his peers deep gratitude for their achievements and their courage—facing down incredible challenges. We live in the greatest country in the world because of men like Dr. Johnson—ones that always believed in America's promise for the future.

ECONOMIC CLIMATE IN BLACK AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus will present eight or nine speakers on the Democratic side in just a few minutes. I am the first of many who will be speaking.

We come to the floor today to express our deepest sympathy and support to the family of Freddie Gray and to the citizens of Baltimore, Maryland.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, the events in Baltimore are not just about police misconduct. It is about pervasive poverty. It is about unemployment, lack of opportunity, hopelessness, and despair.

Since the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson nearly 9 months ago, more than 25 bills have been introduced by members of the CBC that address the need for law enforcement accountability. Today, I call on my House and Senate colleagues to put aside partisanship and take up some or all of these bills. This issue has an impact on all of us.

We must address economic disparities that face Black communities all across the Nation. Baltimore, Mr. Speaker, is not unique.

The economic climate in Black America and the divide that has persisted for generations is due largely to our country's history of disparate treatment of African Americans and lack of opportunity.

While much of the country has experienced an economic recovery over the last 6 years, it has not reached the African American community.

Recently, the CBC and the Joint Economic Committee released a report on the economic challenges facing African Americans. African Americans are struggling and continue to face high rates of persistent poverty, unemployment, long-term unemployment, as

well as significantly lower incomes and slower wealth accumulation.

More than 400 counties in the United States suffer poverty rates greater than 20 percent. These rates have persisted now for more than 30 years. The median income of African American households is \$34,000, \$24,000 less than the median income of households. The median net worth of White households is 13 times the level for Black households. Black Americans are almost three times more likely to live in poverty.

At 10.1 percent, the current unemployment rate for Black Americans is double the rate for White Americans. Black Americans currently face an unemployment rate higher than the national unemployment rate reached during the recession.

African Americans are less likely to obtain education beyond high school than White students. They are less likely to earn a college degree. Even among college graduates, Blacks face worse job prospects than Whites. The unemployment rate for Black workers with at least a bachelor's degree is 5.2 percent, compared to 2.9 percent for White workers.

Forty-four percent of Black Americans own a home, compared to 74 percent of Whites.

In my home State of North Carolina, the unemployment rate for African Americans is 9.9 percent, based on an unemployment rate of 3.2 percent for Whites. The poverty rate for African Americans is 27.5 percent, while for Whites it is 12.6.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, in the District of Columbia, the median household income for African Americans is \$38,300 for Blacks and \$115,900 for Whites, a gap of \$77,000. The D.C. poverty rate is 27.4 percent for African Americans, compared to 7.6 percent for Whites.

Colleagues, these statistics tell the story. These numbers are staggering, troubling, and problematic. It is time for a renewed focus on Blacks in America and a need for real solutions on issues that have persistently plagued our communities.

I will end, Mr. Speaker, by quoting some excerpts from President Johnson's 1964 State of the Union Speech. And he said: "Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope—some because of their poverty, and some because of their color, all too many because of both. Our task is to help replace their despair with opportunity."

"This administration today," he said, "here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America. I urge this Congress and all Americans to join with me in that effort," he said.

"It will not be a short or easy struggle, no single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until that war is won."

President Johnson said: "The richest Nation on Earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it. One thou-

sand dollars invested in salvaging an unemployable youth today can return \$40,000 or more in his lifetime."

President Johnson said: "Poverty is a national problem, requiring improved national organization and support. But this attack, to be effective, must also be organized at the State and local level and must be supported and directed by State and local efforts."

He said: "For the war against poverty will not be won here in Washington. It must be won in the field, in every private home, in every public office, from the courthouse to the White House."

"The program I shall propose," he said, "will emphasize this cooperative approach to help that one-fifth of all American families with incomes too small to even meet their basic needs."

President Lyndon Baines Johnson, January 8, 1964, from this Chamber.

IT IS SILLY SEASON IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it is silly season again in Washington. It is that time of year when we have our annual budget debates and when we realize that only in Washington can an increase actually be considered a decrease.

Later today, we will vote on a bill to fund the Department of Veterans Affairs. That bill increases the Department's funding in real dollars from last year by 5.6 percent, and yet, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim it is a decrease, when, in fact, it is the highest level of VA funding ever provided to the Department.

But even worse, we have a Secretary of Veterans Affairs who is peddling this same intellectually dishonest line as well, the Secretary of a department in which negligence in the past year contributed to the deaths of veterans. Those are the words confirmed by the Office of the Inspector General.

And yet, despite the failure of the Department, the Secretary, earlier this week, had the audacity to go behind closed doors with members of only one party and claim that somehow the 6 percent increase being provided by our committee will, in fact, further the VA's failures of the past.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary has exhibited a level of audacity only seen in Washington. If we are honest, it is an audacity that reflects a style of leadership likely to fail—fail the VA, but most importantly, it is going to fail veterans across the United States because, you see, here is the real story.

We still have hundreds of thousands of veterans waiting for health care and for benefits. We know there is malfeasance in VA construction, and we know the VA continues to declare veterans and dependents dead when they are, in fact, alive. But here is the most important and the most offensive part of the

Secretary's messaging: in the midst of all this, this body has actually continued to trust the Secretary.

You see, when the VA Secretary came before our subcommittee, I asked him, point blank: What will it take to clear the veterans' benefits backlog? And he said: Resources. We need over 700 more employees. We need an increase in resources.

Now, I question that. I will be honest. I think there is a culture that has changed. I think we need infrastructure and IT that has to change. But he said resources, and so we trusted him. Our bill provides full funding for his request to clear the backlog, and yet he continues to say that our side of the aisle somehow, in providing the request that he made of our subcommittee, is going to fail his administration.

It is a despicable display of partisanship at the helm of a department that has no place for partisanship. And so a department that last year was defined not by its successes but by its failures is now needlessly defined by its politics.

And you know the one thing the Secretary did not ask for? Additional funding for the Office of the Inspector General, the office that uncovered the negligence, that reported to Congress on the negligence. Zero increase in funding was requested. So our subcommittee stepped in and we provided an additional \$5 million for that office.

Now, very importantly, we have to acknowledge that this gamesmanship, this leadership failure, should not reflect on the men and women who serve our veterans on the front lines every day. We have great men and women who serve in the VHA and the VBA. I have had the opportunity to visit with them.

Just last week, at our local VA hospital, an elderly veteran was brought to tears telling me how much he appreciated the loving care he was receiving from the employees of the hospital. We must acknowledge their service, their contribution, every day, just as we acknowledge the failure of leadership in Washington, D.C.

So you see, this week's dysfunction, this week's intellectually creative dishonesty, this week's audacity is just Washington "small ball" peddled by this administration, but with real consequences that undermine the confidence of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, only in Washington is a 5.6 percent increase actually a decrease. It is appropriations season. It is, indeed, silly season again in Washington, D.C.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend and chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, in offering condolences

to the parents and family members of Freddie Gray.

I also want to say to Ms. Toya Graham that I feel and can appreciate her anguish and the pain that she showed the world a few days ago.

I want to say to her son, Michael, that I have also felt his pain and anguish, having been on the receiving end of such discipline from my mother. But I want to say to him that he can rest assured that the love of his mother, her passion for his future, will pay great dividends if he continues to show the deference to her love and affection and her concern that he showed when he was the object of her frustrations.

Mr. Speaker, responding to the situation in Baltimore several days ago, President Obama said: "We can't just leave this to the police. I think there are police departments that have to do some soul-searching. I think there are some communities that have to do some soul-searching."

But, he went on to say: "I think, we, as a country, have to do some soul-searching."

I want to join President Obama in calling for the country to do some soul-searching.

Let's take a look at just a few of the institutions of learning in the Baltimore community.

I would like to call attention to one school, Frederick Douglass High School, a school that lists among its graduates the likes of Cab Calloway, Thurgood Marshall, a school that I understand that the father of the current mayor of Baltimore also attended.

I understand there are 789 students at Frederick Douglass High School today. Eighty-three percent of them are listed in U.S. News & World Report's index as economically disadvantaged, and only 53 percent of them are listed as proficient in English, only 44 percent proficient in algebra.

I understand that Carver Vocational Technical High is 100 percent minority, with 79 percent of the students economically disadvantaged.

Coppin Academy, 100 percent minority, with 77 percent economically disadvantaged.

Now, as we listen to all of the pundits, editorial writers reflect on what is taking place or has taken place in Baltimore, I would like to call attention to the lack of soul-searching that is taking place here in this body as we represent the people of America. We have just seen the conference report, or the budget, being proposed by the House Republicans. That conference agreement guts strategic investments in education, workforce training, public health, scientific research, advanced manufacturing, and public safety. It does nothing to help those Americans who are looking for jobs. It does nothing to boost paychecks of working Americans. It disinvests in America.

□ 1045

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF FALL OF SAIGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the last century, a godless totalitarian ideology moved from theory to practice when Communists took over Russia and a global war against freedom began. In the following decades, this ideology slaughtered millions across what was the Soviet Union.

In the 1940s, Communists rolled through mainland China, bringing another reign of terror that killed millions more and that still today limits freedom for the Chinese people.

Also in the 1940s, Communists moved into Vietnam. Those living in northern Vietnam were its first victims. Like other lands under communism's iron grip, Hanoi's rulers killed hundreds of thousands of their citizens. Those who desired and had the means fled to the south.

Throughout the 20th century, America fought against totalitarian ideologies that stripped people of human rights and dignity.

After defeating fascists in World War II, we recognized communism as the single greatest threat to freedom. Indeed, well into the cold war, President Kennedy proclaimed to the world that we would "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

The cold war at times flared hot, and in Southeast Asia, more than 58,000 Americans gave the last full measure of their devotion fighting for the freedoms for which their nation stands.

Today we mark the 40th anniversary of the tragic fall of Saigon. In doing so, we remember the sacrifices made by our Vietnam veterans and their families, sacrifices that continue to today, such as when a Gold Star mother or wife looks at the photograph of a son or husband who never came home, or when a veteran makes a trip to the local VA for chemotherapy for a cancer caused by Agent Orange, or when a congressional colleague notices he does not have full use of a limb because of the torture he endured as a POW, or when the 65-year-old veteran has the same repeated nightmares, or when a 40-something son or daughter envisions the father he or she never got to know. The sacrifices are noble but painful.

The cause they fought for lives on and will continue so long as humanity dreams of freedom, dreams like those of the thousands of boat people who risked their lives to escape Vietnam, including the 65 boat people President Reagan spoke of in 1982 who had the good fortune of being spotted by the aircraft carrier USS *Midway*. When they were picked up, they cried "Hello, American sailor. Hello, freedom man."

Since the last helicopter left the U.S. Embassy roof in Saigon 40 years ago, Vietnam has been under Communist control. And with Communist control has come a shameful human rights record. What was a hot spot in the cold war is now a cold spot for people aspiring to walk, to borrow a phrase from Hubert Humphrey, in "the warm sunshine of human rights."

Vietnam's postwar history began with a purge that resulted in the deaths of thousands. Hundreds of thousands of refugees escaped. Many died in the process, but many survived. Some made it to America, where they pursued the American Dream. They have undertaken diverse endeavors, from running small shops in Orange County, California, to fishing operations in Louisiana, to practicing medicine in places like Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

For those who are still living under the Communist regime, they must be ever-fearful of a government all too willing to crush freedom. Political freedom. Religious freedom. Freedom of the press. Freedom in family life.

In Vietnam, Catholics, Buddhists, Falun Gong, and other religious minorities have been harassed, imprisoned, and persecuted for their faith. In Vietnam, hundreds of political prisoners are held in jail or under house arrest. The Vietnamese Government continues to restrain the press, and they have engaged in coercive population control practices.

Never forget: our servicemembers fought, and many died, to prevent the tragedies Communist rule would impose upon the Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian people, the latter of whom suffered an outright genocide that killed millions.

We are grateful that our servicemembers were able to save thousands of Vietnamese.

To the Vietnam veterans who undertook Operation Frequent Wind 40 years ago this weekend in the chaotic days before Saigon fell, be proud you rescued 7,000 Americans and South Vietnamese. God alone knows the ripples in history that their having escaped will cause.

As we look to the future, let us have a final accounting for all our MIAs. Let us insist that if Vietnam desires to integrate further with the community of nations, then it must allow much greater freedom for its people. And let us hope that the people of Vietnam will not have to endure another four decades of repression and that one day, perhaps this decade, the freedom for which our servicemembers died will finally take root by the South China Sea.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, Congressman BARBARA LEE, for her courtesy.

I join today in standing with my chair, Congressman BUTTERFIELD of the Congressional Black Caucus. I, as well, am overwhelmed with the pain that we have seen not only in Baltimore, which we have seen most recently, but in cities like Ferguson, in North Charleston, in New York, where we have seen the convergence of poverty and the need for criminal justice reform converge.

I too want to offer my sympathy to the family of Freddie Gray. We have watched them over the past couple of days. In the midst of their mourning to be able to stand up and call for peace, nonviolence, nonviolent protests, they should be honored.

And to those in Baltimore, and particularly my colleague from Maryland—I will call him Congressman CUMMINGS with the bullhorn politics, the bullhorn leadership—he should be commended for the stunning and outstanding engagement, that he touched the hearts and minds of his constituents, walked those streets, to be able to acknowledge the pain, the poverty, but that there is a better way, that there is a way toward the stars that we all want our children to have.

And, yes, to Ms. Graham, who wanted better for her son Michael. I want him not to be embarrassed but to be proud that he had a mother with such deep love that she wanted to take him away from doing it wrongly—not against protests, not against the quiet marching of the spirit of Dr. King, but to know that engaging in violence is intolerable and will not allow him to reach the very high heights that he can reach.

Today I stand here to acknowledge the convergence of the need for criminal justice reform and the deep and abiding poverty in the African American community. One in every six Americans is living in poverty, totaling 46.2 million people. This is the highest number in 17 years. Children represent a disproportionate amount of the United States poor population. It falls heavily on the African American community.

In my district, there are 190,000-plus living in poverty. It falls heavily on the African American community.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a standing invitation for the door to open and say, let's blame President Obama. President Obama has been a stellar leader on the questions of realizing the investment in people. From the stimulus that brought us out of the depths of collapse of the markets and a complete imploding of the capitalistic system, he provided the stimulus that moved us toward an economy where we were creating jobs.

But here we have in Congress this dastardly sequester that is cutting Head Start seats, not investing in infrastructure, not creating jobs or providing opportunities for our young people.

So today I say that there needs to be a call for action. That call for action is that this Congress must get rid of se-

quester and must look at the Baltimores and must look at the Fergusons and Houstons and L.A.s and New Yorks and cities across America and realize that we are coming upon a summertime. And if we don't act to invest in our children and to begin to give an agenda to release ourselves from poverty, we will have doomed ourselves.

And I would offer to say that the inertia of moving toward criminal justice reform in this Congress is unacceptable.

I call upon Members to come together collectively to be able to pass legislation, the Cadet bill that I have introduced, the Build TRUST bill. But, more importantly, I am calling upon our government to invest in our youth, to get rid of the poverty, to prepare them as they go into higher education, as they go into upper grades. We must have a program of summer jobs this summer, and we must have a collaborative effort with corporate America.

Wake up, corporate America. Wake up, corporate Baltimore. Wake up, corporate New York. Wake up, corporate Houston. There must be an investment in summer jobs, collaborating with the Federal Government to make a difference to lift families out of poverty. We do know that summer jobs with young people elevate families' ability to pay their bills and to provide resources for their families.

So if the story of Baltimore is any, it is one, don't jump to conclusions. Don't jump to conclusions that Freddie Gray tried to hurt himself. Don't jump to conclusions that these young people don't mean well. Don't jump to conclusions that they shouldn't have done what they have done. Jump to the conclusions that these are young people who are hungry and looking for leadership and are in pain, as Congressman CUMMINGS said.

Look for the opportunity for them. Help rebuild Baltimore. Help give them jobs. Help tell them that the improved relationships between police and community are going to be moved forward as a number one agenda for the United States Congress and this government that they call the United States of America.

Let us have a call to action—not of condemnation, but of action.

I want to thank the young people who nonviolently marched all over America, indicating Black lives matter and all lives matter. The Congressional Black Caucus stands to stamp out poverty, and we stand, Mr. Speaker, to bring opportunities to young people.

HONORING SANDERS-BROWN CENTER ON AGING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Kentucky's Sanders-Brown Center on Aging, which was established in 1979 and is one of the original 10 National

Institutes of Health-funded Alzheimer's disease research centers.

The University of Kentucky Alzheimer's Disease Center, ably led by Director Dr. Linda Van Eldik and her outstanding team of scientists and investigators, supports and facilitates research with a long-term goal of enabling more effective translation of complex scientific discoveries to intervention strategies that improve the lives of patients.

The Sanders-Brown scientists are focused on understanding the mechanisms involved in development and progression of age-related neurodegenerative diseases, such as Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and stroke, and are seeking new knowledge breakthroughs to combat these diseases of the elderly.

This center also promotes education and outreach, provides clinical and neuropathological diagnoses and care of patients with cognitive impairment, and runs an active clinical trials program to test potential new therapies. These activities are critical because, with the aging of the population worldwide and in this country, age-related cognitive disorders, such as Alzheimer's disease, are reaching epidemic proportions, requiring a desperate need to identify strategies for effective therapeutic intervention.

According to a recent report, an estimated 5.3 million Americans have Alzheimer's disease, and that is in 2015 alone. This includes an estimated 5.1 million people age 65 and older and approximately 200,000 individuals under the age of 65 who have younger-onset Alzheimer's disease. Barring the development of medical breakthroughs, the number will rise to 13.8 million by the year 2050.

Almost half a million people age 65 or older will develop Alzheimer's in the United States this year alone. To put that into perspective, every 67 seconds, someone in the United States develops Alzheimer's. By midcentury, an American will develop the disease every 33 seconds.

Alzheimer's disease is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States and fifth leading cause of death for those age 65 or older. There is an enormous cost and financial impact of this disease.

Alzheimer's is, in fact, the costliest disease to society. Total 2015 payments for caring for those with Alzheimer's and other dementias are estimated at \$226 billion. Total payments for health care, long-term care, and hospice for people with Alzheimer's and other dementias are projected to increase to more than \$1 trillion in 2050.

So when we talk about reforming Medicare, when we talk about doing the things we need to do to save Medicare and keep our promises to our seniors, we have to recognize the critical importance and the return on investment that that investment in the National Institutes of Health can have.

I say, in the debates about Medicare reform—and these are important de-

bates—let's pay attention to investment in the National Institutes of Health and particularly the underinvestment in the research that goes on in places like the Sanders-Brown Center on Aging.

□ 1100

This can have an enormous impact on our ability to keep Medicare solvent and also improve the lives of so many Americans. So I call on all of my colleagues here to join me in thanking everyone at the University of Kentucky Sanders-Brown Center on Aging for their contributions to continue the fight against Alzheimer's and other diseases of the elderly.

IMPACTS OF PERSISTENT POVERTY IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise first to send my thoughts and prayers to the family of Freddie Gray and the entire city of Baltimore. Today, another family is grieving another young life needlessly cut short; and, again, a community is searching for answers in the face of tragedy and injustice.

My own community knows this all too well. On New Year's Day 2009, Oscar Grant, a bright young man, was murdered on the Fruitvale Bay Area Rapid Transit platform in Oakland. Our community took to the streets demanding justice.

Freddie Gray, Oscar Grant, Mike Brown, Tamir Rice, and Trayvon Martin and the list goes on, all lives cut short. Today, their stories compel us to come to the House floor to join millions of Americans around our Nation in saying that, like all lives, Black lives also do matter.

Make no mistake, the issues rocking many communities are not a new phenomenon. These tragedies, yes, are a part of a dark legacy of injustice born in the sufferings of the Middle Passage, nurtured through slavery, and codified in Jim Crow.

On April 14, 1967, at Stanford University, Dr. King described these issues in his "Two Americas" speech. He said, "There are literally two Americas. One America is overflowing with the milk of prosperity and honey of opportunity. Tragically and unfortunately, there is another America. This other America has a daily ugliness about it that constantly transforms the ebullience of hope into the fatigue of despair."

The ugly fact is that two Americas still exist nearly five decades later. An African American male is killed by a security officer, police officer, or a self-proclaimed vigilante every 28 hours in the United States. One in three Black men will be arrested in their lifetime, a reason why men from communities of color, unfortunately, make up more than 70 percent of the United States prison population.

Sadly, our laws have made having a criminal justice record a lifetime barrier to the "honey of opportunity" Dr. King described. A formerly incarcerated individual who has paid his or her dues to society and is out of jail is still denied access to Pell grants, closing off the opportunity for higher education and a better job. Ten States enforce lifetime bans on receiving food assistance, SNAP benefits, for drug-related felonies—only drug-related felonies.

Mr. Speaker, these limitations are components of a system that continues to punish someone for life for having made a mistake. This system maintains cyclical and systemic barriers that keep generations of African Americans from building pathways out of poverty.

Recently, the Joint Economic Committee, under the leadership of Ranking Member CAROLYN B. MALONEY, released a report with the Congressional Black Caucus on the economic state of Black America, which Congressman BUTTERFIELD laid out the bleak finding. I hope Members recognize this is a wake-up call.

Children in African American households are nearly twice as likely to be raised in the bottom 20 percent of income distribution as children in White households; and, while African American students represent 18 percent of the overall preschool enrollment, they account for 42 percent of preschool student expulsion—these are kids ages 2 to 5 years old—expulsions. These children don't even get a start, let alone a head start.

The link between the economic inequality and our broken criminal justice system and education is crystal clear, and Congress must do more to break down these systemic barriers.

Our friend and our colleague, our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, said in his inaugural speech when he was sworn in, "America is not working for many African Americans, and we, as the Congressional Black Caucus, have an obligation to fight harder and smarter to help repair the damage."

Mr. Speaker, we must come together as never before to address the systemic, structural, and rampant racial bias endemic in our institutions and criminal justice system.

We have introduced the Half in Ten Act, H.R. 258, to create a national strategy to cut poverty in half in 10 years. By coordinating and empowering all Federal agencies, we can lift 22 million Americans out of poverty and into the middle class, but that is only one step. We must bring serious structural reforms to our broken criminal justice system.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act, H.R. 1232, because war weapons don't belong on Main Street. We also need to pass the Police Accountability Act, H.R. 1102, and the Grand Jury Reform Act, H.R. 429, to ensure accountability and that deadly force cases are actually heard by a judge.

We also need to stop the racial profiling that disproportionately affects African Americans. We need to pass the End Racial Profiling Act, H.R. 1933, because racial profiling has no place in a 21st century police force.

It is also time to pass “ban the box” for Federal contractors and agencies. I am proud to be working with our colleagues on the Senate side, Senators BOOKER and BROWN, to do just that.

We can't stop with the criminal justice system. We have got to create job training, workforce training, and economic opportunities for people of color in marginalized communities who have been, unfortunately, impacted by generations of endemic barriers rooted in discrimination.

BEWARE THE ARROGANCE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you about a brave lady named Ellie, whom I met a few years ago in Kansas. This is her story.

One Tuesday morning, back in 1973, she opened up her local newspaper to read about a U.S. Supreme Court decision that shocked her, outraged her, and saddened her. She questioned how a small group of unelected judges could reach such a tragic and illegitimate decision in the name of constitutional rights.

That case was the fateful Roe v. Wade decision that mandated abortion on demand throughout all 50 States for all 9 months of pregnancy. In response to the Court's ruling, Ellie rushed out to the nearest abortion clinic.

Expecting other outraged Kansans to already be there, Ellie found herself alone. No one else was there. It seemed that the Supreme Court, in far-off Washington, had imposed its radical decision on Ellie and an entire Nation without anyone noticing, few caring, and no one responding about the lives of the unborn.

As history does report, that seemingly deafening silence didn't stay that way. Soon, Ellie was joined by others, many others. Contrary to the expectations of the elite lawyers on the Supreme Court, their decision did not short-circuit or end the debate over abortion; rather, over the following years, it ignited the debate.

While the Court still stubbornly clings to the ruling, science has exposed its folly. Legal scholars recognize its defects. Most importantly, public opinion, from the young to the old, has passed them by. Today, an overwhelming majority of Americans oppose an overwhelming percentage of all abortions.

Today, the Supreme Court may be tempted to repeat that same mistake. They may be emboldened to impose again a so-called 50-State solution on the entire Nation. By radically attempting to redefine marriage for Ellie

and the entire country by invalidating centuries of marriage laws and by silencing the more than 50 million Americans—that is 50 million Americans—who have voted to protect marriage as between one man and one woman, this court would, once again, be repeating their arrogant mistake of misreading both the American public and our American Constitution.

Unlike 1973, I believe that Americans are already beginning to engage on this issue. This time, Ellie will not be alone. If this Supreme Court attempts to shred again another foundational aspect of our society, there will be a strong, quick, and ferocious response, for a small group of lawyers should not impose their redefinition of marriage on every single American State, every single American citizen, every single American family, and every single American church and synagogue.

Therefore, I implore this Court to learn from the Roe v. Wade mistake, do its job, read and obey the Constitution, and correctly affirm that Ellie and the citizens of every one of our united States are free to affirm or restore marriage as the union of one man and one woman.

TO BE POOR IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this opportunity. I feel so proud to be an American and be in this great country where so many Members of Congress have come from families and communities that have been poor, without the dreams or hopes that they would ever be in a position to serve this great country in the most august legislative body in the world.

I know I have been through more riots than anyone else, coming from Harlem and being older than most Members; yet, throughout the world, I am so proud that people respect our country because of the opportunities we have here.

Therefore, to all Americans, it has to be painful and embarrassing to see on international news or to have our international friends think that we are a country that allow young, Black men to be shot down, murdered, and killed and that this is supposed to represent America.

It doesn't really, in my mind, represent our country; it represents poverty, but it is so hard for people to believe that the richest country in the world could have this cancer of poverty that eats away from so many things that we could be doing.

There were so many dreams and hopes when President Obama came in and recognized how much you can accomplish if you have access to education. I was among those who recognized that a bum from Lenox Avenue in Harlem, being given an opportunity with the GI Bill, can go to New York University, go to law school, become a

Federal prosecutor, and come here in Congress.

I knew, Mr. Speaker, the President understood the power of being exposed to education and what it has done to make America all that she is today, but I had no idea of the problems he would face as our President, the depth of people who wanted to prevent him from making a contribution to our country, the partisanship that exists today, and the pain that I feel now when you talk about education, whether or not you support traditional public schools or charter schools, when the greatest thing that we can do and the obligation we have as Members of Congress is to invest in the education of our young people for the future of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, poverty is more than lack of self-esteem. Poverty means that there is a degree in the connection between poverty and hopelessness, poverty and joblessness, poverty in not being able to send your kids to school, poverty in not even knowing how to take care of yourself in terms of health. Poverty can cause people not to be able to make the contributions that they can make to the country.

The disparity between the wealthy people that we have in this country and those who work hard every day and don't have enough money for disposable income, poverty and near poverty reduces the ability of the middle class to have disposable income, to be able to purchase, to support jobs through small businesses.

Poverty is so costly, Mr. Speaker, not only in the prestige, the power, and the expectation of our great country; but how much do we pay to put poor folks in jail? How much, really, do we pay to subsidize earned income tax credits, low-income housing credits, children tax credits, subsidies, not because these things don't pay off, but subsidies because we don't have programs for them? We have to do everything we can. These are costly; but who can deny the return on these types of investments?

The trillions of dollars that we have invested in our defense has little or no return, but the investment that we can have in people and the talent of our minds can make this country all that she can be.

Let's increase education and decrease poverty.

□ 1115

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry, which I chair, conducted a hearing to review the National Forest System and active forest management.

The health of our national forests is an issue of vital importance for rural America. Not only are national forests a source of immense natural beauty, but they provide us with natural resources, healthy watersheds, recreational opportunities, and wildlife habitat.

Perhaps more importantly, they serve as economic engines for the surrounding local communities. Our national forests are capable of providing and sustaining these economic benefits, but they need proper management in order to do so.

The U.S. Forest Service manages more than 193 million acres of land across 41 States. Within those 41 States are over 700 counties containing national forestland. These counties and communities within them rely on us to be good stewards of these Federal lands, and there is a direct correlation between forest health and vibrant rural communities.

The people living in these rural areas depend on well-managed national forests to foster jobs and economic opportunities. These jobs come from diverse sources, such as timbering, energy production, or recreation. However, if those jobs disappear, so do jobs that support those industries. It is a snowball effect from there, threatening school systems and infrastructure in these rural communities.

As a result, effective management and Forest Service decisions have significant consequences on our constituents who live in and around national forests. Healthier, well-managed national forests are more sustainable for generations to come due to the continual risks of catastrophic fires and invasive species outbreaks. Especially with the decline in timber harvesting and the revenue to counties from timber receipts over the past two decades, rural economies will benefit immensely from increased timber harvest.

We can continue supporting a diverse population of wildlife through active land management practices, such as prescribed burns. Our national forests are not museums. They were never intended to sit idly. I say it frequently, but national forests are not national parks.

When Congress created the National Forest System more than 100 years ago, it was designed so that surrounding communities would benefit from multiple uses. Our national forests are meant to provide timber, oil, natural gas, wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, and clean drinking water, not just for the rural communities, but these tend to be the headwaters of the waters that provide water for our cities as well.

During yesterday's hearing, members of the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee called upon Forest Service Chief Thomas Tidwell to use the tools that Congress made available in the 2014 farm bill in order to strengthen rural economies and improve the health of our national forests. One certainly complements the other.

POLICY FAILURES OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about the policy failures of this body.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at Baltimore, let me tell you why it is not a shock to me. It is because when you disinvest in education, when you provide no places for kids to play and no summer jobs, Baltimore happens. When you refuse to provide resources for job training for decent housing and you have a lack of resources to the communities of highest need, Baltimore happens.

The budget we are working on this week continues to prove that the majority of people in this House care little about the plight of the poor and underserved communities. There is a lack of concern for education.

I sit on the Education Committee as we are talking about reauthorizing ESEA, and the majority passed out of committee the ability to block grant all title I funding. So now children who are poor, disabled, or minority will be at the mercy of their State to determine what kind of education they get. Ohio has one way to do it; Indiana has another way to do it. It all depends on what your ZIP Code is anymore as to what your educational attainment may be. They, further, have reduced Federal funding for education every year of their plan.

I work in a body where the majority wants to block grant Medicaid. So State by State they will determine who qualifies, who is sick enough to qualify. I work in a body where there is no value placed on our greatest asset, which is our people. These are the people who want to reduce block grants and community funding and community policing.

Our communities are crying out every day for our attention. Did what happened in Baltimore get our attention? It should have, and it did. Was it right? No. Violence is never right. But we have to hear the cries of the people in need.

So today, I want to say to the Gray family and all of the people who are in the streets in Baltimore: I apologize. I apologize for a body that has failed you. I apologize for people who only give lip service to the poor. I apologize because we could do better to make your lives better.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility as the leaders of this Nation to take care of the people who need us the most.

Miss Gray, I apologize.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 21 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Michael Siegel, Anshe Emet Synagogue, Chicago, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, instill within the Members of the House of Representatives the deep understanding of the potential that this day holds as they work together for the common good of all people in this great land.

Open their hearts to respond meaningfully to the voices of those who hunger for justice, hunger for equality, and hunger for opportunity.

Give them the strength and wisdom to ensure the security of this great Nation and her friends around the world.

On this day that George Washington was inaugurated as the first President of the United States in 1789, we ask You, God, to bless each and every Member of this august body with the same courage that he exhibited in his time, in order to fulfill the vision and purpose of this great land for us and all who will follow in the future.

Let us pray that together this body, together, will do their part to create a world worthy of God's presence and God's blessing.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, April is Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, and I rise to support the goals and ideals we have been promoting these past 30 days.

More than 200,000 people in the United States are sexually assaulted each year. One in five women will be sexually assaulted during her college years.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. Our work is not done until the number of sexual assaults is zero. Sexual assault is an affront to our basic humanity. It threatens our individual liberty, family values, and basic human rights. Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our children to live up to those values.

We must reject the passive, quiet acceptance of sexual assault that has pervaded our society for far too long. We must refuse to accept that which is unquestionably unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, although April is coming to an end, we must remain committed to raising awareness, empowering survivors, and preventing more people from experiencing these heinous acts.

WELCOMING RABBI MICHAEL SIEGEL

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend Rabbi Michael Siegel of Chicago, Illinois, for his service today as guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

As the rabbi of the congregation closest to Wrigley Field, for 30 years, Rabbi Siegel's prayers for the Cubs have gone unanswered; however, Michael, again, assures me this is the year.

More seriously, throughout his 40-year career, Rabbi Siegel has been a dedicated leader in the Jewish community, serving both locally and nationally.

Since 1873, Anshe Emet has been a center for Jewish study, cultural activity, and Israel advocacy. Under Rabbi Siegel's leadership, the synagogue has grown and truly fulfilled its commitment to the entire community of Israel—*klal yisrael*—and healing the word—*tikkun olam*. I am grateful for my punctuation and pronunciation keys. I am also grateful that my constituents can be part of a such an inspiring community—*kehila*.

Please join me in thanking Rabbi Siegel for leading us in prayer today as

guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to kick off May as National Mental Health Awareness Month.

I stand here to bring attention to the dire need to improve the awareness and dialogue surrounding mental health. Far too long, we as a Nation have neglected mental health. It is one of our most critical health problems today.

Mental illness occurs more frequently, affects more people, requires more prolonged treatment, and causes more suffering to individuals and families than most people could ever realize.

I have personally witnessed and experienced the physical and emotional burden mental illness has on the individual and the family. A close family member of mine took their life at a very young age.

Despite having major hospitals and universities in the Syracuse area, there simply are not enough mental health resources to help, especially in the pediatric realm. People in the central New York area often have to travel hours to receive inpatient care, disrupting lives, jobs, and families. Once released, the followup care is lacking, and oftentimes, the patients immediately regress.

Unfortunately, the lack of resources—in the case of central New York—is not an uncommon issue. As I acknowledge May as Mental Health Awareness Month, this Friday, May 1, I will launch a mental health task force based in New York's 24th District. The task force will be comprised of mental health leaders in the field, including hospitals and employees.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the tens of thousands of students who have been left in the lurch after their for-profit school, Corinthian Colleges, abruptly closed this week.

The closure came as a surprise. It was the middle of their semester. Many of these students are now buried in student loan debt and do not know how or if they can continue their education.

I have urged the Department of Education to make it very clear to these students that they have the option to have their loans forgiven. However, the Department of Education has been encouraging students to transfer to other troubled for-profit schools, rather than have their loans discharged.

Many of the for-profit schools on the Department's list of so-called viable

transfer opportunities are currently under State or Federal investigation. This is shocking and unacceptable.

I call on the Department to remove immediately any school currently under investigation or on heightened cash management from its list of recommended options.

Our students deserve better. Let's give them the guidance that they can trust.

NATIONAL YOUTH ORCHESTRA

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, each summer, Carnegie Hall's Weill Music Institute brings together some of the brightest young musicians from around the country to form the National Youth Orchestra USA.

The members of the orchestra spend the first 2 weeks in residency at Purchase College, taking master classes from the best. They have the chance to perform at the world famous Carnegie Hall, where their performance is heard live around the world; then they go on tour.

This summer, the orchestra will make a historic visit to China. It is an incredible experience, and I am extremely proud that, among the 114 amazing young people, two are from the district I am privileged to represent, Ms. Jasmine Lavariega, a horn player from Astoria; and Laura Michael, an oboist from Manhattan.

Congratulations to them both. Please let your parents know they were right; all that practice, practice, practice paid off. It was worth it. You are performing at Carnegie Hall and in China.

Congratulations.

F/A-18 SUPER HORNET

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to thank my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee—in particular, Chairman MAC THORBERRY and Ranking Member ADAM SMITH—for all the hard work they have put into crafting our country's national priorities for the upcoming year, way into the wee hours of the morning.

Specifically, I want to thank them for responding to a critical Navy shortfall and a national security need by including the authorization for funding of 12 F/A-18 Super Hornets in the National Defense Authorization Act.

The Super Hornet is truly the workhorse of naval combat operations against the Islamic State and is playing an important role in protecting our warfighters abroad. Twelve additional Super Hornets will help keep a critical production line open that will allow for

additional strike fighter jets and electronic warfare attack in the future.

However, our work isn't finished. I look forward to supporting the NDAA when it comes to the House floor and fighting for Super Hornets to be included during the appropriations process.

□ 1215

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say that the budget resolution being moved through Congress right now will help America's middle class.

I wish I could say that this budget will help provide opportunities for struggling Americans and security for our seniors.

I wish I could say that this budget will help raise stagnant wages, help our kids attend college, and help our businesses create jobs.

I wish I could say all of that, but I can't.

What I can say is that the budget being pushed through the House today would make hard-working Americans work even harder and take home even less, while benefiting special interests and the ultrawealthy.

I ask my Republican colleagues to partner with us in a bipartisan fashion to create a budget that will benefit all Americans.

FIXING THE ISSUES AT THE VA

(Mr. HUDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are working through a bipartisan Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill that contains a lot of good measures, that keeps the VA under the magnifying glass, and helps guarantee top-notch care for our Nation's heroes, our veterans.

Continuing to fix the issues at the VA needs to remain our top priority, but the solution is not throwing more money at it, Mr. Speaker. We spend more now on the VA than at any point in our history, but too much money is wasted on the bureaucracy here in Washington and doesn't get down to the caregivers and to our veterans who need the care.

My constituents and veterans across the Nation are waiting months for routine exams, while others who need special care are stuck in backlogs. Mr. Speaker, it simply isn't fair, and it is not tolerable.

Our veterans deserve the best, and we can deliver that by breaking up this bureaucracy in the VA. We should give our veterans the option to get health

care at the VA if they choose, or to go to a private healthcare provider in their local community and have the VA pay for it.

Until we move to that system, Mr. Speaker, the VA at the top is going to continue to soak up the money, and the veterans at the bottom are going to continue to not get the care that they deserve.

I ask my colleagues to continue to work with me so that we provide the best health care in the world to our veterans, that we keep the promises we made.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET'S IMPACT ON ACCESS TO SECONDARY EDUCATION

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget we are going to consider later today is a step in the wrong direction for students. At a time when student loan debt is at an all-time high, we need to be doing more to help students, not less.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget will make students work harder for less. It will hurt low-income students by cutting \$89 billion for Pell grants. It will dramatically cut back the loan repayment programs that help all student loan borrowers pay affordable rates. And for Americans in job training programs, more than 2 million may be turned away from the critical training programs they need to change careers or secure advancement at work.

Students of all types deserve access to quality, affordable education, but this Republican budget cuts critical programs that help our students get ahead. Mr. Speaker, our young people are 25 percent of our population and 100 percent of our future. We can and must do better.

ENHANCING VETERANS ACCESS TO TREATMENT ACT

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Enhancing Veterans Access to Treatment Act, legislation that eliminates bureaucratic hurdles so veterans using the VA can continue to receive the same lifesaving mental health medication they access while on Active Duty.

Currently, the VA requires a veteran to switch their medication when that drug is not included in the VA's drug formulary, regardless if the drug is working. Instead, the VA will put the veteran on different medication and requires them to fail first before they are switched back, or the vet must go through an appeals process to remain on the current medication.

Instead, this bill simply says, if it works, keep it. This bill allows seam-

less continuity of medication and leaves any decision to change up to the doctor.

It is not enough to just have the DOD and VA share a limited medication list, because when it comes to psychotropic medication, the doctor needs to have available the full spectrum of choices.

With 22 veterans dying each day by suicide, these veterans don't have time to wait to get their medication for their depression or anxiety.

I ask all Members to please join me in cosponsoring the Enhancing Veterans Access to Treatment Act so we can solve this problem.

GOOD NEWS FROM NIGERIA

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week we received good news. On Tuesday, 200 girls and 93 women were rescued from Boko Haram camps by the Nigerian military in the Sambisa Forest. Yesterday, another group, 160 women and children, was rescued in the same forest.

These reports bring me great hope. My heart goes out to these women, girls, and their families, who have experienced their worst nightmare.

I am hopeful that the Chibok girls, who were kidnapped over a year ago, are a part of these ongoing rescue missions by the Nigerian Army.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked my fellow Congresswomen to wear red in honor of the missing girls and vote together in of the well of the House of Representatives. Together, we called attention to the atrocities by Boko Haram, called for the return of all of the kidnapped girls, and called for Nigerian leaders to be held accountable by the world.

It takes the political will of the Nigerian Government and the conviction to do what is right to eradicate Boko Haram and end their tragic reign of terror.

We hope to wear red every Wednesday. I will not stop speaking, stop tweeting and fighting on behalf of these girls, their families, until the girls are safely returned.

Tweet bringbackourgirls and tweet #joinrep.wilson.

THE STAPLE ACT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, every year, students from around the world come to the United States to access our high-quality education and universities and colleges. And many of these students obtain doctoral degrees in science, technology, engineering and math, and have job offers from numerous employers that need their expertise and their skills.

However, too often, our immigration rules send these graduates, some of the

best and brightest minds who will be highly skilled workers and entrepreneurs, back to their home countries to become our competitors rather than helping grow and create jobs right here.

Today, I am introducing bipartisan legislation, the STAPLE Act, with my colleague, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY, to help fix this problem and keep America on the forefront of innovation. The STAPLE Act will exempt recent STEM graduates with a Ph.D. with pending job offers from H-1B visa quotas.

Mr. Speaker, our immigration system is broken, and we must take action to ensure that the system is fair and that it keeps America competitive, and passing the STAPLE Act is a good step in the right direction.

THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Office of Technology Assessment, the OTA.

For 22 years, the OTA was a key non-partisan resource for Congress as it dealt with scientific and technical policy issues. The OTA was overseen by a Technical Advisory Board composed of six Senators and six Representatives, evenly split between the two parties.

The OTA was able to provide easy-to-understand explanations of complex scientific issues. For example, in 1988, the OTA provided a study called "Healthy Children: Investing in the Future," showing that infants with low birth weights were more susceptible to a variety of physical and mental disabilities. This study helped change Medicaid eligibility rules by expanding access to prenatal care to millions of women, saving lives and taxpayer money. This, and other reports, provided the information needed to make reasonable policy based on scientific results.

This Congress needs scientific guidance, and I urge my colleagues to join me in calling for the reestablishment of the Office of Technology Assessment.

SUPPORTING THE PTC ELIMINATION ACT

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, if we are serious about making the Tax Code simpler and fairer, then we have to get rid of deadweight handouts. The PTC Elimination Act, which I have authored with Congressman POMPEO, is a step in that direction. The bill scales back and repeals the wind production tax credit.

The PTC was created over 20 years ago to help new forms of energy get on their feet. Today, it is a largely bloated

subsidy for the fully grown multi-million-dollar wind industry. The mature wind industry shouldn't be spooned by taxpayers any longer. The PTC needs to end.

By taking this no-longer-needed tax credit off the books, the PTC Elimination Act brings fairness to our Tax Code and enhances competition. That is the kind of tax simplification we need to reinvigorate the American economy.

TRANSPACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Japan's Prime Minister addressed Congress.

Each U.S. President has their Japan opening initiative. All fail, as will President Obama.

Soothing words are what Prime Minister Abe gave Congress yesterday. But here is the scorecard for U.S. trade with Japan:

There hasn't been a single year of trade surplus for our country, not even balance. Rather, over the last 20 years, we have had \$1,963,654,100 trillion lost dollars; U.S. dollars that have gone to Japan from us buying their products, but their markets remain closed to ours.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is not a trade deal. It should be debated as a treaty. It is a foreign policy arrangement that is part of the shift to Asia.

As for the trade portion of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, it facilitates the movement of more U.S. jobs and corporations into Vietnam and other nations in the region. Labor costs there are chasing cheap labor a third of that of China now, and will ease the movement of those goods back into—guess where—our country again.

We have seen it before. It is time for Congress to stand up for the workers and communities of the United States of America. Let us start building back our middle class rather than keep shipping it out every place but here.

CELEBRATING NEW HAMPSHIRE'S EDUCATORS

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and give thanks to all New Hampshire's educators as we celebrate National Teacher Appreciation Day.

Oftentimes our teachers don't get the thanks or credit that they deserve. Granite State teachers devote their lives to providing our children with the tools, the resources, and the attention necessary to be the very best that they can be.

It is our teachers who listen to our children, challenge them, and inspire them to dream the impossible. They

spend countless hours devoted to preparing our kids for the next challenge, whether that be passing a test or navigating conflict. They don't simply prepare them for the grammar quiz on Friday; they prepare them for the events that will test them throughout their lives.

So to all those who teach our kids that anything is possible with hard work and dedication, thank you. To all those who encourage our students to shoot for the stars, I say, thank you. It is because of you that our Nation remains the world leader of innovation, ideas, and excellence.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP SCHOOL

(Mrs. LUMMIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the National Outdoor Leadership School.

NOLS was founded in Wyoming by Paul Petzoldt. NOLS has taught thousands of Americans and people worldwide about the responsible use of the outdoors and an appreciation for outdoor activities, recreation, hiking, that is unsurpassed.

NOLS is headquartered in Wyoming, in Lander, and we are proud that NOLS's mother ship is in our dear State. NOLS is a wonderful organization that provides stewardship of our natural resources in a way that teaches people how to enjoy and appreciate the outdoors.

Congratulations, NOLS, the National Outdoor Leadership School, on 50 years.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1732, REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 43, DISAPPROVAL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 231

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities

with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-13 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate.

SEC. 3. Section 604(g) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act shall not apply in the case of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally

divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend (if otherwise in order).

POINT OF ORDER

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against House Resolution 231 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 1732, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I was sworn into this Congress, there was quite a bit of fanfare about how many women now serve in this body. But even with all of these women, this body is still 80 percent male.

Men are running the show, and the sideshow that they have used to distract us from the real reasons each of us was elected has been a persistent, absurd, arrogant, and ignorant effort to impede upon a woman's right to make her own choices about her health.

We have wasted—absolutely wasted—taxpayer dollars and valuable time here on the floor of the House again and again and again trying to legislate away something our highest Court confirmed years ago.

We could have spent that time talking about the recent rash of police brutality cases that have long plagued communities of color, an issue that has now caught fire in the streets of Baltimore, just a few miles north of us.

We could have discussed the lack of job training programs preparing workers for careers in technology and health, the fastest-growing professions in an economy doing nothing for the long-term unemployed.

We could have used this time to work on protecting our seniors by expanding Social Security, keeping even more older Americans out of poverty.

We could have debated any issue that would offer better opportunities for our constituents, which is what each of us was elected to do.

Instead, we put Members of Congress one place we have no right to be; and

that is, in a woman's uterus. Women are the only ones who have the right to make the inherently private health choices that they are faced with.

Mr. Speaker, when the legislation we are preparing to debate came before the House Oversight Committee, I was particularly disturbed. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle gave us a slew of well-meaning arguments about why we so desperately needed to violate the self-rule of the District of Columbia.

One of these men, a former minister, explained employers, who are moved by faith to judge and persecute their employees, should be free to do so. He went on to say that employers should have every right to freely exercise their faiths and that the District's effort to ensure employees don't lose their jobs because of in vitro fertilization or birth control or any other reproductive healthcare choice was part of a "continued attack" on religion.

One thing that is particularly wonderful about this great Nation is that we offer everyone a right to have an opinion.

As a mother, a grandmother, and a devoted woman of God, I couldn't help wondering how men, who are so very adamant about forcing mothers to have these babies, could refuse to ensure they have access to care.

The same folks calling for bills like this one have called for cuts to programs across the spectrum that will give their children and their mothers access to education, access to healthy meals, and all kinds of tools to assure they are not stuck in the cycle of poverty. So once they have funneled women into the path that brings a child into the world, my colleagues would prefer to say, "God bless you," and walk away.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation this rule would force us to consider is absolutely wrong. It violates the will of the District's voters; it violates the privacy and the rights of women; and most relevant to this point of order, it violates rules of this body for interference in State and local governments.

It is now my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), someone who recognizes just how awful this legislation is and the only Member whose constituents will have to deal with the outcome.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from New Jersey for her extraordinary remarks and for her generosity in yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this rule has the high stink of both unfairness and discrimination. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee voted to overturn a valid local District of Columbia law but denied D.C.'s locally elected officials even the courtesy of defending that law, which is aimed at keeping employers from discriminating against women and men for their private reproductive health decisions, the most personal decisions Americans make off the job.

Of critical importance, the D.C. local law requires that all employees carry out the mission of the organization or business, whatever its mission is. The disapproval resolution was only added to the Rules Committee agenda yesterday, literally at the same time that the committee began its meeting. And no member of the majority showed up at the hearing to defend the disapproval resolution until I noted this unprecedented absence. The committee then hurriedly summoned the subcommittee chair, who spoke without any prepared testimony.

No wonder—how can any American defend an employer who imposes his religion or personal philosophical beliefs on an employee's private reproductive matters by sanctioning the employee because the employer disagrees, for example, with an employee's use of in vitro fertilization to become pregnant or of birth control for family planning?

The employer has no right to even know about such private matters. But if he learns of an employee's reproductive preferences, the D.C. law requires that he must not use this private matter to discriminate on the job.

Not surprisingly, we do not expect this disapproval resolution to be considered on the House floor—in the light of day—until late tonight, for fear that the American people will watch Congress sanction, for the first time ever, discrimination against women and men for their reproductive health decisions and see Republicans violate their own professed mantra for local control of local affairs by overturning the law of a local government for the first time in a quarter of a century.

I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairwoman of the Rules Committee in whose jurisdiction the unfunded mandate point of order resides.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding time.

The question before the House is, Should the House now consider H. Res. 231? While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of today's measures—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and the rules of the House.

The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina may proceed.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, while the resolution waives all points of order

against consideration of today's measures, the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This is a dilatory tactic.

These measures will protect our farmers, ranchers, and business community from a massive Federal overreach being perpetrated by the EPA, approve our FY16 budget that puts us on a path to rein in reckless spending, reform entitlement programs, and protect the religious rights of D.C. employers.

As a mother, a woman, and an individual of prayer, I am very glad that we are here today defending life and our Constitution, consistent with our congressional prerogatives.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle act shocked that we are debating this issue. But what is truly shocking is that we need to be here today at all, discussing whether to grant employers in the District of Columbia the rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment, but we are.

I would further like to point out to our colleagues across the aisle some of the words of the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted."

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about discrimination against people here. We are discussing the protection of innocent life. As Members of Congress, we have a heightened responsibility to protect the rights of D.C. residents because the Constitution in article I, section 8 gives the Congress explicit jurisdiction over the country's seat of government.

It is under that authority that we consider H.J. Res. 43, a resolution to disapprove the action of the Council of the District of Columbia in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014, or RHND.

Our country holds as its most fundamental freedom the right to practice freely one's religion and associate with others who hold the same beliefs. It is unthinkable that we could allow the leadership—if you want to call it leadership, the people in control of Our Capital City—to infringe on that right for the millions of Americans who live or work inside its borders. But that is what RHND does.

It tells churches, religious schools, and advocacy organizations that they may not make employment decisions based on their own core principles, including the respect for precious unborn life, a principle that is central to many of these groups' entire belief system.

Cloaked in language purporting to prohibit discrimination and promote

tolerance, this law targets these organizations and tramples their rights to exercise their views on the respect for life.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, this law discriminates against and promotes intolerance of anyone who disagrees with the world view of the majority of the D.C. City Council. It is not discriminatory for a church or religious school to believe and preach that life begins at conception. It is not discriminatory to practice these deeply held beliefs; that is, unless you are in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, this law may force religious organizations to relocate outside the District of Columbia in order to protect their rights. Given the clear hostility the City Council has shown them and what we have heard on this floor today, that may, in fact, be the ultimate goal.

When we take our oath of office as Representatives, we promise to protect and defend the Constitution. That includes protection of religious freedoms, and it is why I support H.J. Res. 43 which disapproves RHND.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 174, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—240

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Ellmers (NC)
Allen	Chabot	Emmer (MN)
Amash	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Amodei	Clawson (FL)	Fincher
Babin	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Barletta	Cole	Fleischmann
Barr	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Barton	Collins (NY)	Flores
Benish	Comstock	Forbes
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fortenberry
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Foxx
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Crawford	Garrett
Bost	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Boustany	Culberson	Gibson
Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Goodlatte
Brat	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Bridenstine	Denham	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Granger
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Buck	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Doggett	Griffith
Burgess	Dold	Grothman
Byrne	Duffy	Guinta
Calvert	Duncan (SC)	Guthrie

Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock

McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce

Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette

Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer

Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff

Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Black
Cardenas
Clay
Fudge
Gohmert
Hudson

Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Kildee
Langevin
Lewis
Payne

Quigley
Roskam
Rush
Shuster
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1312

Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PALAZZO changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, this is House Resolution 231 down here today. I have got a copy right here. It has been so long since the Reading Clerk read this to us that folks may have forgotten. This represents a lot of what I would argue is best about this institution, and I want to take a little pride and tell folks about what the Rules Committee has been working on.

It makes in order H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, the EPA and others are hard at work, I would argue, at trying to exert brand-new jurisdiction over waters currently regulated by the State of Georgia. It is the largest power grab over water I have seen in my lifetime and, I would argue, in the history of the Republic. This bill aims to roll that back. Yet, as the committee reported it, there are always other folks who have ideas, so what the Rules Committee did is to

make in order every single Democratic amendment that was offered to this resolution.

If we vote to support this rule today, we will consider this bill. The House will work its will, and it will work its will by considering every single Democratic alternative that was offered. I think that is an important step. It is going to make the legislation better when we move it to final passage, and I am glad this rule provides for that. I hope folks will support that underlying rule.

Passing this rule today will make in order S. Con. Res. 11, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

Mr. Speaker, I almost feel like I need to explain what a concurrent resolution on the budget is because, if you are like more than half the Members of this House, you have never seen one before. More than half the Members of this House have never served when the United States of America got together and passed a budget. It is outrageous, Mr. Speaker. That was yesterday that it was outrageous, and today is about the opportunity to do this.

The House worked its will on the budget. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee made in order every single budget alternative that was offered, both Republican and Democrat. The House debated. The House worked its will. We passed a product. We worked that product out with the Senate. If we pass this rule today, Mr. Speaker, it will be in order to debate the first concurrent budget in my congressional tenure—these two terms—and the first balanced budget since 2001, but only if we make this rule in order.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, is H.J. Res. 43, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council, that this rule will make in order.

Now, for folks who don't follow that, we don't see it that often. In fact, since Republicans first took over Congress for the first time in 40 years back in 1994, we have never seen one of these resolutions before. It is the first one, but it comes from the District of Columbia Home Rule Act. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution delegates to Congress all of the authority for governing the District of Columbia. It is article I, section 8. All of the authority for the governing of the District of Columbia lies in this body.

In 1974, we passed the D.C. Home Rule Act, which allowed for the coordinated governance of D.C., and it included this resolution of disapproval allowing Congress to come back and reject actions that the District of Columbia has taken. Again, folks will not have seen this unless you were in Congress in 1991 when Democrats were controlling the House and Democrats were controlling the Senate. Unless you were here then, you would not have seen one of these resolutions passed. It was last passed in 1991 with folks rejecting the deliberations of the D.C. Council.

This rule makes in order the consideration of that joint resolution again today. It is exactly what was contemplated when, for the very first time in the history of the United States of America, the Congress delegated some of the power of controlling the District of Columbia to the city itself. In the language that designated that authority to begin with, it provided for this resolution of disapproval. For the first time in almost 20 years, this House is considering one of those today.

That is what you get in this rule, Mr. Speaker. It provides for debate on all of the Democratic amendments offered; it provides for debate on those bills that are exactly as the D.C. Home Rule Act anticipated; and it provides for debate on the first confereed budget that most Members in this House have ever seen. It is a shame this is the first time we have had an opportunity to do it, but, golly, is it exciting that we have an opportunity to do that together today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for the consideration of three unrelated pieces of legislation: a Republican budget conference report, an anti-Clean Water Act bill, and a resolution to interfere with the decisions of the District of Columbia's city council and a bill that limits women's reproductive health rights.

The budget conference report was filed only minutes before the Rules Committee met yesterday, only minutes before the committee formally convened. It was a 100-page conference report that was negotiated in secret by the Republicans, and it was brought before the Rules Committee before anybody had a chance to read it. What ever happened to "read the bill"? Whatever happened to the pledge for a more open and transparent Congress? It would be nice if all Members, Democrats and Republicans, had the opportunity to carefully review the legislation they are asked to vote on, especially when it comes to a document that provides a blueprint for funding the Federal Government and reforming our social safety net programs.

If that weren't bad enough, the majority claims that this budget conference report is something to be proud of. Mr. Speaker, this is nothing to be proud of. It is shameful. It is shameful in terms of process, and it is shameful in terms of substance. Budgets should be moral documents. They provide our constituents with a clear picture of who we are, of what our priorities are, how we should govern, where we want this country to go. They represent our

values, but the values that this budget represents, I would argue, are not the values of working families in this country, and they are not the values of those who are struggling to get out of poverty. They may be the values of corporate special interests or of very wealthy individuals in this country, but they don't represent the values of the majority of people in this country.

This partisan Republican budget takes us in the wrong direction. It cuts \$5.5 trillion in funding through a series of unrealistic spending cuts, math magic, and gimmicks. It asks nothing of the wealthiest among us, proposes no elimination of special interest tax breaks, and continues us down the terribly misguided path created by sequestration. In fact, to be honest, Mr. Speaker, this budget basically provides us a pathway to do not a lot of anything, really.

We already know that, unless we deal with the issue of sequestration, our colleagues in the United States Senate are going to block all of the appropriations bills. We know that the President will not sign any appropriations bills that lock us into sequestration. Maybe what we should be doing, rather than wasting time, is fixing sequestration, but my Republican friends have been very good at wasting time and at wasting taxpayer dollars, and that is what we are doing today.

The Republican budget conference report proposes to end the Medicare guarantee and turn it into a voucher program. It turns Medicaid and CHIP into a capped block grant. It eliminates \$85 million from Pell grants. It cuts investments in research and in infrastructure. The budget resolution builds upon the draconian \$125 billion cut to SNAP, which is the Nation's premier antihunger program that was contained in the House budget. To achieve a cut of that magnitude by block granting the program and capping its allotment means that States will be forced to cut benefits or kick eligible individuals and families off the program.

Boy, isn't that a nice value that we are promoting here—throwing poor people off of a food benefit. Just because the conference report is vague on some details or leaves out a few key buzzwords doesn't mean that it protects programs for the poor. Unfortunately, this Republican Congress has shown time and time again that it plans to balance the budgets on the backs of the poor and working class Americans.

The conference report also includes reconciliation instructions to repeal the Affordable Care Act without proposing an alternative to ensure the 16 million people who have gained health coverage under the ACA are able to remain insured. That is right. If the Republicans get their way, being a woman is, once again, a preexisting condition, and preventative care goes away. Simply, the progress that we have made over the past few years disappears.

Senior citizens will see their prescription costs increase. In budgetary terms, we will be worse off when repealing the Affordable Care Act because it will result in higher medical costs and sicker people. It is just that simple. It is a bad idea, but it is a good sound bite, I guess.

Despite claims by my friends in the majority, this budget does not balance. It nowhere near balances. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is filled with gimmicks and contains the very dangerous addiction Congress has for deficit spending by further increasing funds for the overseas contingency operations account, or OCO. Not only does this budget increase the OCO's war spending, but it also facilitates using the OCO as a slush fund for items that should be funded in the base budget. Everything in OCO is on the national credit card. None of it is an emergency. It is deficit spending, pure and simple.

I commend my colleagues on the Republican side who are raising a little hell about this kind of budget gimmick that is going on. This is outrageous. While we continue to pump up the deficit and to pump up the OCO account, we watch our roads and our bridges and our water systems crumble for lack of funding, and we starve our education and our job training and innovation programs.

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the outrages contained in the Republican budget. We are still in the process of combing through the 100-page document that was just filed yesterday, and I am sure there will be additional issues that we will want to raise.

In addition to this awful budget, today's rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 1732 and H.J. Res. 43.

H.R. 1732, Mr. Speaker, would basically force the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers to withdraw its proposed rule on Clean Water Act jurisdictional boundaries and start the rule-making process over again from scratch. Mr. Speaker, the current rule-making process should be allowed to move forward. The EPA and the Army Corps have painstakingly engaged in an extensive stakeholder outreach and public comment process. They are doing their jobs. The rule is grounded in sound science. H.R. 1732 would cause further confusion, and it would end up delaying essential clean water projects for future generations, not to mention, Mr. Speaker, that a rider in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which is being considered by this House today, would prohibit the Army Corps from spending any money to propose a new rule.

In one bill, my friends basically null and void what the bill we are going to debate today is intended to do. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in this partisan approach that the majority has taken with regard to clean water legislation and environmental protection legislation.

There is another bill in here, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to say a few

words about that. It is H.J. Res. 43, disapproving the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker, the D.C. Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act is scheduled to take effect this Saturday. The law passed unanimously by the D.C. City Council. This would protect employees who work in the District of Columbia from workplace discrimination based on their personal reproductive healthcare decisions. The bill is about basic fairness. People should be judged at work based on their performances, not on their personal, private reproductive healthcare decisions. But House Republicans cannot pass up an opportunity to meddle in personal reproductive decisions or in D.C.'s right to govern itself.

The resolution before us, H.J. Res. 43, would prevent the law from going into effect. In doing so, it would allow an employer to fire a woman because she used in vitro fertilization or to demote an employee because she used birth control pills or because her husband used condoms or to pay an employee less because his daughter became pregnant out of wedlock.

□ 1330

In other words, we are a few months into 2015, a year-and-a-half away from the Presidential election, and the Republicans are already restarting their war on women. Sometimes it feels like this Congress is stuck in the mindset of 1815 rather than 2015.

Let my colleagues make no mistake about this: H.J. Res. 43 is about legitimizing discrimination. Enough already.

Mr. Speaker, earlier the gentlelady from North Carolina, my colleague on the Committee on Rules, came on the floor and said we in Congress need to protect the citizens of D.C. Protect them from what? From their own democratic process? Give me a break. Let me tell my Republican colleagues, the citizens of D.C. don't want your protection or your interference. They want this Congress to respect them and their decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this is another lousy piece of legislation that really shouldn't be here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on America's priorities instead of resuming the attack on women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. TORRES) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement for the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of working men and women instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities like eliminating poverty instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of America, like jobs, jobs, jobs, instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. BASS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the country instead of another attack on women's health care in Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida? There was no objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on jobs and the economy, the real priorities of the American people, instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the American people instead of another attack on women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of the American people—job creation and getting a stronger economy—rather than attacking women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York? There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will first make an announcement.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure, embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to

accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD, and the House should be focusing on the real priorities facing Americans: the economy. They should not be rolling back women's access to health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement into the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of America instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member on the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my

statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our Democratic leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to insert my statement in the RECORD that the House should focus on the real priorities of Americans instead of another attack on women's health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), one of our young leaders in this Chamber.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for all the work that he has done to protect life and religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong disapproval of religious discrimination in the District of Columbia's local government.

Mr. Speaker, one of the founding principles of our great country is the freedom to worship without government interference. Our forefathers fought and died for that liberty, and I stand before you today to make sure they did not die in vain.

The law passed by the D.C. City Council attacks the core religious beliefs of faith-based organizations, schools, and pro-life advocates. Under this law, these groups could be forced to pay for health services that are in direct conflict with their fundamental religious beliefs. Under this law, a D.C.-based nonprofit whose sole mission is to end abortion could be forced to pay for abortion services. This is not only unacceptable but stands in direct opposition to the Constitution and Federal law.

This is why I am proud to cosponsor Congresswoman BLACK's resolution that formally expresses Congress' disapproval of the D.C. pro-abortion law. I

stand here to defend the rights of religious institutions and pro-life companies to honor their faith and respect the sanctity of life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that life is our greatest gift. I admire the work that many of these faith-based and pro-life organizations do to change the hearts and the minds in this abortion debate, and I will not stand idly by to watch their religious freedoms trampled. I urge my colleagues to do the same and vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say for the record, I strongly disagree with what the gentlelady just said, and we will have some more time to talk about that, but I want to go to kind of a different subject right now.

For those who are watching these proceedings, it may be a little confusing because we are jumping around to different subjects, but my Republican friends have this new kind of ploy to limit and stifle debate, and that is pack as many bills into one rule at a time so that you can limit the amount of participation and debate, which, again, runs contrary to what the people's House is supposed to be about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask at the end of all this that we defeat the previous question, and then I will offer an amendment to the rule that would grant the House an opportunity to consider a budget that rejects the mindless sequester cuts in critical services and instead adopt a plan to put the budget on a fiscally responsible path by making responsible, targeted spending cuts, and by closing special interest tax breaks that benefit only the very wealthiest. It would make necessary investments to boost the economy and create jobs, protect national security, and preserve the Medicare guarantee.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, primarily because of the gimmickry and the coldheartedness of the conference budget. It is not just myself who has understood the tricks and gimmicks that were used to formulate this so-called balanced budget, which doesn't, of course, balance.

It is kind of like if I had gone out and said I am going to spend \$2,000 on a cheap racehorse. This is the weekend of the Kentucky Derby. I am going to go out and buy a cheap racehorse, and I am going to enter it in the Kentucky Derby. The horse is going to win the Kentucky Derby, and then I take that prize money from the Kentucky Derby—I might even be so bold as to predict it is going to win the Triple Crown, and I take all that money and put it in my budget as if I had actually done it. That is the way this budget was constructed.

But, again, it is not just me. Virtually everyone who has looked at this budget—detached, impartial observers—says this is not legitimate budgeting. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget noted that the House budget uses “several budget gimmicks that circumvent budget discipline,” adding that “the details are in some ways unrealistic and unspecified.”

□ 1345

The CRFB also observed about the Senate budget, “Disappointingly, many of the savings are unrealistic or lack specificity.”

Taxpayers for Common Sense said, “This isn't budgeting, it's gimmickry.”

The Fiscal Times noted that “there is a widely held belief among many Federal budget watchers that Republicans had to resort to budgetary smoke and mirrors to create a pathway to a balanced budget.”

While my friend from Georgia and other members of the Rules Committee and the Budget Committee are praising the fact that they were able to construct a budget that balances the first time since 2001, it doesn't balance.

For instance, what it does is it eliminates, repeals—or calls for the repeal—of the Affordable Care Act and then takes all of the savings and revenues from the Affordable Care Act and counts that as a way to add \$2 trillion to the positive side of their budget over 10 years.

That is not accurate budgeting. That is gimmickry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman from Kentucky an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague.

That is not legitimate budgeting. That is just fantasy. That is really what the budget is about.

Unfortunately, though, there is a very cruel side to this budget. As my friend from Massachusetts said, this does real damage to the American people. It does damage to hard-working families who are trying to get ahead. It actually ends up being a tax increase on hard-working American families.

It repeals the Affordable Care Act, and I just want to talk a little bit about what the Affordable Care Act has done in my State because, if this were to actually happen, here is what the impact on my citizens would be.

In Kentucky, according to the DeLoitte professional services firm that did an audit of Kentucky's experience and a projection over the next 6 years, the Affordable Care Act will contribute \$30 billion of additional economic activity in the State, create 44,000 jobs, and have a positive impact on the Kentucky State budget of \$850 million. That is in one State.

If you repeal the Affordable Care Act, not only do you do great damage to the health of Americans, taking insurance

away from 16.5 million—in my State, 550,000 who have gained insurance just in the last year and a half—but you are doing real damage to our education, to our infrastructure, to our investment in research, to our seniors. Under this bill, seniors will suffer a great financial hardship, as well as a loss of benefits.

There is real damage, as I said, to be done with this budget, but I think the most disturbing part of the entire debate is the fact that this is not a budget that balances. Yes, the numbers at the end on the plus and negative side add up.

They actually match after 10 years, but all of the bases for getting there is about as reliable as, again, if I bought that racehorse and said I am going to win the Kentucky Derby and counted those winnings before that race was ever run.

I oppose the rule on the basis of this conference report on the budget. I think it does great damage to the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank my colleague for his leadership today and every day. I really appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and, more broadly, H.J. Res. 43, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her leadership and her conviction on this issue.

We all want to protect the free speech and beliefs of all Americans, but too often, the line is drawn to discriminate against those with pro-life views. Ironically, this is often done under the guise of antidiscrimination, which is exactly what has happened in the District of Columbia.

Under the recently passed ordinance, religious institutions and other pro-life employers in our Nation's Capital could be forced to make decisions that violate their deeply held religious beliefs.

Despite the Supreme Court ruling in *Hobby Lobby*, for instance, under this ordinance, religious employers could be compelled to cover elective abortions in their healthcare coverage or face discrimination charges.

It would also prevent faith-based employers from taking actions against employees who participate in activities that run counter to the mission of that organization. For instance, a pro-life crisis pregnancy center couldn't terminate an employee who undermines their cause by volunteering at an abortion clinic.

As a strong pro-life individual myself, it boggles my mind that the government could force like-minded individuals to violate their conscience in such ways. Frankly, no American should be comfortable with such discrimination.

We must take swift action to stop this ordinance, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is founded on two simple and powerful principles, liberty and equality.

In the 18th century, our Founding Fathers saw liberty as freedom from the dictates of a tyrannical government and fought to the death to protect it. What they could not foresee is a modern form of tyranny, the tyranny of employers who seek to impose their beliefs on their employees and control their personal decisions.

I am saddened that, today, my Republican colleagues are bringing up yet another bill to enable employers to control their private, personal decisions of their employees. Today, this body may, with a single vote, strip over 650,000 American citizens of their essential liberty to make their own choices about their health care and their families.

Make no mistake, the District of Columbia's new law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act, is about liberty. We are not talking about an employer who objects to paying for insurance that covers contraception.

D.C. passed this law to protect the citizens from an employer who tells a woman that she will be fired for using contraception or for using in vitro fertilization to start a family or for engaging in any other conduct that violates the employer's religious beliefs.

The D.C. law we are asked to overturn says your employer should not be able to impose his religious beliefs on you. You should not be fired because your religious beliefs differ from those of your employer. The D.C. law protects religious liberty. The disapproval resolution imposes religious coercion.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle who claim so vociferously to support freedom and liberty stand here today and say to the American people: you do not have the right to make decisions about when and how to start a family; your employer has the right to make those decisions for you.

I challenge any Member of this body to go home this weekend and explain that to their constituents and why they must now live under the yoke of their employer's tyranny. The American people will not stand for it, and we must not stand for it today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and "no" on the disapproval resolution. We must send a strong message to the American people that freedom and religious liberty still exist in this country.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a member of the class of 2010, and a public servant.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. I appreciate my colleague from Georgia yielding me

time to discuss this rule and the underlying issue.

I do want to report that it was 229 years ago that the Virginia General Assembly ratified the Virginia statute for religious freedom. This was authored by Thomas Jefferson. The statute serves as the model for the free exercise clause in our First Amendment. This is what it said:

No man shall . . . suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument, to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion.

Mr. Speaker, religious freedom is a fundamental human right protected by our First Amendment. It is essential to our free and flourishing society. Our Nation was found, in part, by individuals seeking refuge from religious persecution, from religious discrimination. For these pioneers and for all to come after, America was meant to be a permanent fortress of liberty and freedom for all who live within its walls.

At its essence, the concept of religious freedom is about much more than religion. It is much more than just showing up to worship service 1 day or 1 night a week. It is about our fundamental human right to hold our own beliefs and to live out our lives according to these faiths.

Religious freedom, quite simply, is about freedom itself. This is why the very first part of the very First Amendment to our Constitution is about religious freedom. It is our first and most cherished liberty.

However, our ability to be free to live out the convictions of our faith not only in the public square, but also in the privacy of our own homes, in our churches, in our businesses, is in jeopardy right here in our Nation's Capital.

The misleading name RHND is nothing more than a legalized discrimination. If allowed to go in effect, the government would force pro-life organizations, pro-life ministries, pro-life business, pro-life churches, pro-life individuals in the District to violate the very heart of their lives and their work and be coerced into paying for abortion on demand and be forced to hire antilife individuals who actually promote abortion. As a Catholic and as an American, I am offended by such coercion.

Now is the time for Congress to stand up against this direct assault on our freedom of religion, our freedom of association, and our freedom of speech.

I encourage my colleagues to join me and honor our constitutional oath of office by adopting this rule and passing H.J. Res. 43.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the many Democrats who have rallied to

the defense of reproductive health decisions of men and women in the District of Columbia, especially since this is a resolution to overturn a District of Columbia law that everyone in this Chamber will be able to vote on, except me.

I wish to respond to a set of untruths you have heard from the other side that, for example, the D.C. law is an assault on religion. On the contrary, it protects an employer's religious beliefs. He can hold those religious beliefs if that is part of what his organization does. The employee must advocate those beliefs. Whatever the organization or business, the employee must advocate the employer's views, not his own. What the employer cannot do is to go into the employee's bedroom to find out what kind of reproductive choices he makes on his own as a private matter.

Abortion has been raised as if it were in this bill. In fact, just the opposite—the D.C. law makes it clear that insurance is not involved, paying for abortion is not involved.

Republicans have done almost the inconceivable. They have resumed, with this disapproval resolution, the war on women, by adding men.

The D.C. law protects all employees from job discrimination by the employer for their reproductive health choices. For example, if the employer discriminates against a male employee who has contributed sperm for in vitro fertilization to help his wife become pregnant, that male employee is also protected.

There has been an attempt to tie the D.C. law to abortion; but, if an employee refuses to carry out—indeed, to advocate—the mission of the organization that opposes abortion, then that employee can be fired.

In fact, you can ask that employee before that employee is hired: Will you advocate vigorously against abortion the way this organization does? That employee must say yes, or that employee may not insist on any right to be hired.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the manager of this bill never defended the bill on the merits; instead, he defended the tyranny of Federal power over local matters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. The Home Rule Act, in its terms, Mr. Speaker, does not—and it says so—envision overturning local law, and it says so in its terms. There are only a few matters that the Home Rule Act mentions that cannot be enacted, and the matter on the floor is not one of them.

Republicans have been champions for federalism and local control; yet they are trying to impose their own preferences on a local jurisdiction whose Member cannot even vote for or against it. This is a double whammy.

Their goal here is to resume the war on women. The predicate for getting to

the Nation's women is the D.C. Home Rule Act. It goes after D.C.'s right to self-government and women at the same time.

The coming attraction in your district is that this bill or a version of it is pending all over the country. Stop it here, or it will spread throughout the United States of America.

□ 1400

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Rules Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my colleague from Georgia for the great leadership he shows in the Rules Committee and on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made many comments. Some of them, I am going to do my best to refute comment by comment; others, I am just going to talk about in general.

Their one charge is that Congress should stay out of the business of governing D.C. Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress explicit jurisdiction over the country's seat of government. The extent to which Congress should oversee or intervene in the governance of the District is a debate for another day, but it is clearly our responsibility.

Current law compels congressional oversight, and we must exercise responsibly that jurisdiction. That includes acting to stop legislation that clearly violates the constitutional freedoms of the citizens of the District.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that women are protected by law, both Federal and D.C., from discrimination on the basis of pregnancy. Their personal medical decisions are also private under HIPAA protections.

This discussion is not about how someone chooses to conduct their personal affairs. It is about whether the D.C. government may force an organization to hire, retain, and promote someone who actively opposes their central mission and core beliefs.

Pro-life groups, religious organizations, and Republicans, are not the only ones to see significant problems with RHND. Even former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray cautioned that RHND goes too far, and called the bill "legally insufficient" and "legally problematic."

Whatever his position may be on life issues, he recognized that the approach taken by the City Council does not adequately protect free exercise. He further noted that the measure "raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religions Freedom Restoration Act."

The District's own attorney general also expressed concerns that "religious organizations, religiously affiliated organizations, religiously-driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law's applicability to them."

The D.C. Council's cavalier attitude toward the constitutional rights protecting religious practice and belief is deeply troubling. Unfortunately, RHND is a harbinger of continued efforts to undermine the right of free exercise and association.

RHND denies these fundamental rights to pro-life organizations and religious groups who do not fit the narrow definition of "ministers" exempted from the D.C. law. Under this law, these organizations can be forced to hire, retain, and promote individuals who work actively against their central mission and core beliefs.

The clear and shameless targeting of these organizations must be opposed by anyone who values the rights guaranteed to us by the First Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, our oath of office requires us to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The Supreme Court ruled unanimously in 2012 that religious organizations have the right to hire individuals that support their mission, saying: "The interest of society in the enforcement of employment discrimination statutes is undoubtedly important. But so, too, is the interest of religious groups in choosing who will preach their beliefs, teach their faith, and carry out their mission . . . The church must be free to choose those who will guide it on its way."

Consistent with our oath of office, I commend this rule and disapproval resolution for our support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is extreme, and it is an outrage to women everywhere. The Republican majority is saying with this resolution that they think a woman's employer has a say in the woman's reproductive healthcare choices, even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution, and women all across this country know that they don't.

It is bad enough that the majority party believes your boss should dictate whether your healthcare plan covers birth control. Now they want to make sure your boss has the right to fire you just for using birth control.

If that was all they were saying, that is outrageous enough, but it is not. This resolution would actually give employers the right to fire an employee for the reproductive healthcare choices of their spouses, or even their children.

Think about it. The other side is saying that it is all right to fire someone because their boss doesn't like their wife's, or even their children's, healthcare choices. Talk about restricting someone's rights.

It would take away a whole range of women's private decisions and make

them fireable offenses. In vitro fertilization, you are fired. Exercising your right to choose, you are fired. You have a daughter on birth control, you are fired.

This is outrageous, ridiculous, and totally unacceptable. It is an insult to women everywhere. And even more amazing is that this resolution is being proposed by the so-called party of states' rights.

They are not proposing a Federal law. They are taking away the rights of a locality, the District, Washington, D.C., which is larger than some States and has a population larger than most States.

This is a new low in this Congress. I urge a strong "no" vote.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for folks who were just turning on the TVs back in their office, they may think we are in the middle of issue debate right now—not the case. We can get into issue debate as soon as we pass this rule to begin that debate.

What makes me so proud about the work that we do in the Rules Committee is that it makes in order the ability to have these kinds of in-depth discussions.

We can't have this kind of discussion right here—there are three topics in this bill—because these three topics in this bill will come later in the day, each being discussed individually.

I will go back to where I began, Mr. Speaker. We are exercising responsibilities of the Constitution under Article I, section 8, that require us to do oversight on the District of Columbia. Similarly, we are pushing back on executive overreach in H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. That is that big Federal grab over all the water that our States are currently regulating. And finally, we will be bringing up that balanced budget, the first reconciled budget that most in this Chamber have ever seen.

This rule makes that debate possible. It will be a free and open debate on the budget, as we allowed every single budget to be debated earlier on this floor, it is going to be an open debate on H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, where the Rules Committee made in order every Democratic suggestion that was offered there, every amendment that came before the Rules Committee. And it will be an up-or-down vote after debate on H.J. Res. 43, the resolution of disapproval, as the very 1974 act that provided for self-governance of the District of Columbia anticipated.

If we pass this rule, Mr. Speaker, we can get into that substance, and I look forward to a robust debate on all three of those topics.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN, for your leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to H.J. Res. 43. This bill would undermine the District's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act, which would protect employees who work in the District from workplace discrimination based on the employee's personal reproductive healthcare decisions.

For example, this includes prohibiting an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control.

Simply put, this rule and bill is yet another Republican attack on women's access to health care and another battle in the war on women. And of course, as always, you target the women of the District of Columbia to set a standard for the rest of the country.

What in the world is the connection between your private healthcare decisions and job performance? This is so cynical. It is so wrong. No woman should have an employer or a politician interfering in her personal health decisions.

The D.C. government has a right to determine how they want to protect their workers. Employees should be evaluated at work based on their performance, not on their personal and private reproductive healthcare decisions.

The District of Columbia seeks basic fairness for its women, and this rule and this resolution are outrageous. It is undemocratic and, once again, ignores the Home Rule Act. Yes, Congress should not be dictating any policy to the District of Columbia. This debate has been held. The Home Rule Act was passed in 1973.

Instead of undermining the law that seeks to protect the citizens and women of D.C. from discrimination based on their private reproductive healthcare decisions, we should be getting back to the real business that Congress needs to address, like strengthening our economy, lifting families out of poverty, criminal justice reform, and creating job opportunities for all.

So let's defeat this. Let's support the District of Columbia and its decisions. Let's respect them. Let's respect the women of the District of Columbia. They, too, have that right.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Massachusetts I do not have any further speakers remaining, and I would inquire if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Thank you to the gentleman from Worcester for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and its assault on Americans' reproductive health rights. All women should have the right to make their own healthcare de-

cisions without fear of losing their jobs.

With reports of women being fired for undergoing in vitro fertilization and being fired for being a single mom, the City Council of Washington, D.C. passed a resolution to ban workplace discrimination based on personal reproductive healthcare decisions.

This joint resolution does not infringe on religious liberty. It ensures the freedom to practice individual religious and moral beliefs. This decision of the D.C. Council will protect women and ensure that reproductive health decisions are made by women and not their employers and not corporations.

It is 2015, and I would love for Congress to be debating women in the workplace. We should be talking about how we achieve equal pay, how we increase paid sick leave, and how to help working families make ends meet. We should not be stripping away the progress that has already been made.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ quarter minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend, because I would like to correct some misstatements from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the former Mayor and the former Attorney General never detailed what their concern was, but just in case, the District passed an amendment that made it clear that insurance and abortion are not covered by this bill.

I want to be explicit.

□ 1415

A pro-life organization is not required to hire someone who advocates against abortion. An employee must carry out and must advocate whatever is the mission of the organization.

This bill has an exception for organizations' religious and political views. Both must be carried out.

The 1973 Home Rule Act has not come to this floor before because only three times in 25 years has it been taken up, and that was mostly because D.C. mistakenly wandered into Federal matters. That is why this Federal authority was retained in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, not to overturn local law whenever the other side simply disagreed with it.

I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amend-

ment in the RECORD along with extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question and vote "no" on the rule. I just wanted to make that clear before I continue here.

Mr. Speaker, it is frustrating to come to the floor and have to squeeze into a very short period of time three different bills on one rule. These are three very controversial bills.

You have heard about the bill that essentially is a war on women in the District of Columbia, that denies women and men their privacy and their right to reproductive health care. We have a bill in here also that essentially tries to gut the Clean Water Act, which is very controversial and has a very direct impact on the health and well-being of the people of this country. And then we have this budget that was filed minutes before the Rules Committee met. Nobody read it.

I should also point out that the Rules Committee reports that, although the resolution waives all points of order against provisions in H.J. Res. 43, the committee is not aware of any point of order. Well, one of the points of order is the 3-day layover, which is being violated, so the committee is waiving a point of order with regard to that.

Look, we should be debating an immigration reform bill. We should be debating a pay equity bill. We should be debating an increase in the minimum wage. We should be debating a comprehensive long-term highway and transportation reauthorization bill to help rebuild this country. There are so many important things that we should be debating, and, instead, we are bringing these wedge issues to the floor. We are bringing an anti-environmental bill to the floor that is going nowhere, and we are bringing a budget to the floor that paves the way for a lot of nothing.

Unless we fix the sequestration problem, the Senate is not going to take up any of these appropriations bills, and neither should we.

We ought to put the American people first and put the electioneering off. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I love about this institution is my colleagues come to the floor with different life experiences. They come with different opinions. They come with a different set of bosses. The 700,000 folks that I call my boss back home in Georgia, I am sure, have very different views than those who call themselves the boss of my friend from Massachusetts.

But I tell you, the three bills that this rule makes in order—not that this

rule declares a foregone conclusion of passage. No. It just makes in order for debate on the floor of this House. These three bills are exactly the kind of thing that this House should be working on, and I am proud to bring it today.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, I don't serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. That is where this resolution of disapproval has come from. I did last cycle. I don't this cycle. I have heard colleague after colleague come to the floor and defend the rights of not being fired because your sister or your daughter or your son or your brother used birth control.

Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous. I can't imagine that someone would be fired for what their sister or their brother does in terms of their reproductive health choices. I agree. I agree. And if there is an opportunity to work together to prevent that from happening—that is apparently happening en masse here in the District of Columbia—I want to be a part of it.

But the truth is, it is not happening en masse. In fact, it is not happening at all. It is not happening at all.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind being lectured by my friends to get back to the business of the people. I do not mind. In fact, I am onboard with it every single day of the week. We can start earlier, and we can start later, and I will be here. But do not, Mr. Speaker, do not lecture me on getting about the business of the people and come down with story after story after story that is not what this legislation is about, that is not a problem, that is not something that any of us disagree on.

Mr. Speaker, we have some legitimate disagreements on this floor, and if we pass this rule, we will be able to get into the nitty-gritty of those disagreements.

But we do not disagree on the freedom of family members to make their own reproductive health choices without it impacting our own employment.

I will say to my friend sincerely: if we can find a case in the District of Columbia—I don't mean a case this year; I don't mean a case last year; I mean a case ever of that happening—seek me out as your partner, and I will help you. Because what folks seem to miss here in this conga line of frustration is that if we reject the D.C. Council's resolution, we return D.C. to the law of the land as it exists, when? Today. We don't take a single right away from anybody. We don't take a single freedom away from anybody. We are not interested in doing that whatsoever. What we are interested in doing is protecting religious freedom.

It turns out, if you live in Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, you might work for an institution that lobbies for life. You might work for an institution that focuses on faith. This is a town of ideas, Mr. Speaker.

In the rush to pass a piece of legislation—these are not my words. These are the words of Vincent Gray in his letter to the members of the council of the District of Columbia:

In the rush to push this bill through, the council did not take the time to protect this cathedral of freedom that we have here, did not take the time to make sure that that first and most important of our constitutional freedoms was protected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is the Constitution. There is nothing that the District of Columbia can do to undermine the Constitution. But they can cause a lot of problems for folks along the way. This is a resolution of disapproval to prevent that from happening.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill that is here, H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, my friends suggest that we are talking about clean water in this country, that this is about Republicans undermining clean water.

I will say again, as I said about the resolution of disapproval: if we pass this bill, we will roll the regulatory environment of clean water so far back, it will be just like it is today. That is what we are going to do. I just want to be clear about those radical ideas that my friends on the left have suggested.

If we have the will in this body to pass this bill, we are going to roll regulations so far back, it will be exactly like it is as I am standing here today.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill is about is preventing the regulatory overreach going forward.

Guess what: I live in Gwinnett County, Georgia. I challenge you to have a water treatment plant that does a better job than we do. We have a water fountain right there where the sewage gets treated, Mr. Speaker. You can go ahead and press that water fountain and have yourself a drink. That is how clean it is. We put it back into the lake cleaner than we take it out of the lake.

I will not be lectured by my friends in an executive office downtown about how to clean water in the State of Georgia. I promise you, I care more about clean water in Georgia than anyone on Pennsylvania Avenue does. We are succeeding today.

If we have a problem with State regulation of clean water, come to me. I will be your partner. We will work on that together.

The problem is not that Georgia isn't doing a good job. The problem is, the Feds are planning to get in the way of Georgia doing a good job. This bill will stop it. If we pass this rule, we will be able to have that debate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill that makes me the proudest is our concurrent budget resolution. My friends have lots to say about why it is this budget doesn't balance. Let's be clear: I believe that they are wrong.

But what is more important in this discussion, Mr. Speaker, is that my friends don't want the budget to balance. We had a free and open debate on this floor. We considered every budget that any Member of this Chamber wanted to offer, every single one.

An interesting thing happened, Mr. Speaker. Every Republican budget that was introduced balanced within 10

years and didn't raise taxes on hard-working Americans. Every single budget the Democrats introduced never balanced—not in 10 years, not in 20 years, not in 100 years—and every single one raised taxes on hard-working Americans by trillions of dollars. Trillions of dollars in new taxes, and it still didn't reach balance.

My friends, I understand we have a fundamental disagreement about how this country ought to be run, and I am glad that we have that debate here in this Chamber. We are a deliberative body. I respect the opinions of my friends. I do believe there is a common ground that we can come to. But, Mr. Speaker, this is that common ground today.

For years, the budget wasn't even passed in the United States Senate, much less try to bring it together so that the House and the Senate are working off a single page of music.

For the first time since 1991, this Chamber has done its job in concert with the Senate. It is no small thing. Far from being something to be criticized, it is something to be celebrated.

I don't know where the votes are going to be, Mr. Speaker. Conferencing something with the Senate is hard. I promise you that my bosses back home in Georgia have a much more conservative view of the world than many of the folks do in the United States Senate. But guess what, I don't get everything I want every day. But what I get is an opportunity to come together to build that bridge of common ground and agreement.

That is the agreement we have before us today—not my ideas, not Democratic ideas, not Republican ideas, but collaborative House-Senate ideas—a budget for the Federal Government for the first time in 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues: Take a look at this rule. You will be proud. Take a look at the work of the hard-working people in the Rules Committee upstairs—nine Republicans, four Democrats getting together late in the evening, trying to make the rules work—you will be proud.

Every single Democratic amendment was made in order on the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. The resolution of disapproval, brought exactly as the Home Rule Act intended: last used by Democrats to disapprove; today used by this Chamber.

And finally, that budget brought only after every single Member's ideas were debated, and the best rose to the top.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support from all of my colleagues for this fair and honest rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 231, the special rule governing consideration of the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016, included a prophylactic waiver of points of order against its consideration and it was described as such in House

Report 114–98. Due to an unexpected change in the legislative schedule, the waiver of all points of order against consideration would now include a waiver of clause 8(a)(1)(A) of rule XXII, prohibiting the consideration of a conference report until the third calendar day on which the conference report has been available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is important to note that the text of the conference report and the joint explanatory statement were made available in electronic form on April 29, 2015.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 231 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

In section 2, strike “except one hour of debate.” and insert “except one hour of debate and one motion to recommit with instructions that the Managers on the part of the House—

(1) reject the austere and mindless sequester spending cuts in critical services and instead offer a plan to put the budget on a fiscally responsible path by making responsible, targeted spending cuts and by closing special interest tax breaks that benefit only the very wealthiest.

(2) provide equal increases in both defense and non-defense spending above the sequester cap levels to:

a. make necessary investments that boost the economy to create jobs, rebuild our infrastructure, educate our children and sharpen the nation’s competitive edge;

b. avoid another unnecessary and harmful government shutdown; and

c. protect national security, including law enforcement, homeland security, defense and international programs that help protect the nation; and

(3) protect Medicare and reject attempts to end Medicare’s guaranteed benefit by turning it into a voucher system that will increase costs for seniors and destabilize the traditional Medicare program that has served seniors well for half a century.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a

vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule . . . because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 181, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Blum	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Bost	Chabot
Allen	Boustany	Chaffetz
Amash	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Amodei	Brat	Coffman
Babin	Bridenstine	Cole
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barton	Buchanan	Comstock
Benishek	Buck	Conaway
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Cook
Bishop (MI)	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Byrne	Cramer
Black	Calvert	Crawford
Blackburn	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw

Culberson	Joyce	Rigell
Curbelo (FL)	Katko	Roby
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Denham	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Dent	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	Kinzing (IL)	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	Kline	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Knight	Rooney (FL)
Dold	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Duffy	LaMalfa	Roskam
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Ross
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Rothfus
Ellmers (NC)	Latta	Rouzer
Emmer (MN)	LoBiondo	Royce
Farenthold	Long	Russell
Fincher	Loudermilk	Ryan (WI)
Fitzpatrick	Love	Salmon
Fleischmann	Lucas	Sanford
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Flores	Lummis	Schweikert
Forbes	MacArthur	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Fox	Marino	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	Massie	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy	Shuster
Garrett	McCaul	Simpson
Gibbs	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Gibson	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Stefanik
Gosar	McSally	Stewart
Gowdy	Meadows	Stivers
Granger	Meehan	Stutzman
Graves (GA)	Messer	Thompson (PA)
Graves (LA)	Mica	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)	Tiberi
Griffith	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Grothman	Moolenaar	Trott
Guinta	Mooney (WV)	Turner
Guthrie	Mullin	Upton
Hanna	Mulvaney	Valadao
Hardy	Murphy (PA)	Wagner
Harper	Neugebauer	Walberg
Harris	Newhouse	Walden
Hartzler	Noem	Walker
Heck (NV)	Nugent	Walorski
Hensarling	Nunes	Walters, Mimi
Herrera Beutler	Olson	Weber (TX)
Hice, Jody B.	Palazzo	Webster (FL)
Hill	Palmer	Wenstrup
Holding	Paulsen	Westerman
Hudson	Pearce	Westmoreland
Huelskamp	Perry	Whitfield
Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger	Williams
Hultgren	Pitts	Wilson (SC)
Hunter	Poe (TX)	Wittman
Hurd (TX)	Poliquin	Womack
Hurt (VA)	Pompeo	Woodall
Issa	Posey	Yoder
Jenkins (KS)	Price, Tom	Yoho
Jenkins (WV)	Ratcliffe	Young (AK)
Johnson (OH)	Reed	Young (IA)
Johnson, Sam	Reichert	Young (IN)
Jolly	Renacci	Zeldin
Jones	Ribble	Zinke
Jordan	Rice (SC)	

NAYS—181

Adams	Cleaver	Fattah
Aguilar	Clyburn	Foster
Ashford	Cohen	Fudge
Bass	Connolly	Gabbard
Beatty	Conyers	Gallego
Becerra	Cooper	Garamendi
Bera	Costa	Graham
Beyer	Courtney	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Bonamici	Cummings	Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez
F.	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Hastings
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Higgins
Bustos	DeLauro	Himes
Butterfield	DeBene	Hinojosa
Capps	DeSaulnier	Honda
Capuano	Deutch	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Dingell	Huffman
Carney	Doggett	Israel
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	F.	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Chu, Judy	Ellison	Kaptur
Cicilline	Engel	Keating
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Esty	Kennedy
Clay	Farr	Kildee

Kilmer	Moulton	Schrader	Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Scalise	Ruppersberger	Sewell (AL)	Tonko
Kind	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David	Hunter	Mooleenaar	Schweikert	Rush	Sherman	Torres
Kirkpatrick	Nadler	Serrano	Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin	Ryan (OH)	Sinema	Tsongas
Kuster	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sires	Van Hollen
Langevin	Neal	Sherman	Issa	Mulvaney	Sessions	Sanchez, Loretta	Slaughter	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Nolan	Sinema	Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus	Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Veasey
Larson (CT)	Norcross	Sires	Jenkins (WV)	Neugebauer	Shuster	Schakowsky	Speier	Vela
Lawrence	O'Rourke	Slaughter	Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Simpson	Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez
Lee	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Johnson, Sam	Noem	Smith (MO)	Schrader	Takai	Visclosky
Levin	Pascarell	Speier	Jolly	Nugent	Smith (NE)	Scott (VA)	Takano	Walz
Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)	Jones	Nunes	Smith (NJ)	Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Takai	Jordan	Olson	Smith (TX)	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Loeb sack	Peters	Takano	Joyce	Palazzo	Stefanik		Titus	Yarmuth
Lofgren	Peterson	Thompson (CA)	Katko	Palmer	Stewart	NOT VOTING—8		
Lowenthal	Pingree	Thompson (MS)	Kelly (PA)	Paulsen	Stivers	Kirkpatrick	McKinley	Waters, Maxine
Lowe y	Pocan	Titus	King (IA)	Pearce	Stutzman	Lewis	Payne	Welch
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Price (NC)	Tonko	King (NY)	Perry	Thompson (PA)	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Wasserman	
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Quigley	Torres	Kinzinger (IL)	Pittenger	Thornberry		Schultz	
Lynch	Rangel	Tsongas	Kline	Pitts	Tiberi	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE		
Maloney, Carolyn	Rice (NY)	Van Hollen	Knight	Poe (TX)	Tipton	The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.		
Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Vargas	Labrador	Poliquin	Trott	□ 1504		
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Veasey	LaMalfa	Pompeo	Turner	So the resolution was agreed to.		
McCollum	Ruiz	Vela	Lamborn	Posey	Upton	The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.		
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Velázquez	Lance	Price, Tom	Valadao	A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.		
McGovern	Rush	Visclosky	Latta	Ratcliffe	Wagner			
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Walz	LoBiondo	Reed	Walberg			
Meeks	Sánchez, Linda T.	Waters, Maxine	Long	Reichert	Walden			
Meng	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson Coleman	Loudermilk	Renacci	Walker			
Moore	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)	Love	Ribble	Walorski			
	Schakowsky	Yarmuth	Lucas	Rice (SC)	Walters, Mimi			
	Schiff		Luetkemeyer	Rigell	Weber (TX)			
			Lummis	Roby	Webster (FL)			
			MacArthur	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup			
			Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Westerman			
			Marino	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland			
			Massie	Rohrabacher	Whitfield			
			McCarthy	Rokita	Williams			
			McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)			
			McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman			
			McHenry	Roskam	Womack			
			McMorris	Ross	Woodall			
			Rodgers	Rothfus	Yoder			
			McSally	Rouzer	Yoho			
			Meadows	Royce	Young (AK)			
			Meehan	Russell	Young (IA)			
			Messer	Ryan (WI)	Young (IN)			
			Mica	Salmon	Zeldin			
			Miller (FL)	Sanford	Zinke			

NOT VOTING—9

Frankel (FL)	Polis	Wasserman
Lewis	Scott (VA)	Schultz
McKinley	Smith (MO)	Welch
Payne		

□ 1455

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

AYES—242

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Coffman	Fox
Allen	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Amash	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Babin	Comstock	Gibbs
Barletta	Conaway	Gibson
Barr	Cook	Gohmert
Barton	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Benishkek	Cramer	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gowdy
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blum	Denham	Griffith
Bost	Dent	Grothman
Boustany	DeSantis	Guinta
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bridenstine	Dold	Hardy
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Buck	Ellmers (NC)	Heck (NV)
Bucshon	Emmer (MN)	Hensarling
Burgess	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	Fincher	Hice, Jody B.
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Hill
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Holding
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Hudson
Chabot	Flores	Huelskamp
Chaffetz	Forbes	Huizenga (MI)

NOES—181

Adams	DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)
Agullar	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Ashford	Dingell	Lawrence
Bass	Doggett	Lee
Beatty	Doyle, Michael F.	Levin
Becerra	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted
Bera	Edwards	Lipinski
Beyer	Ellison	Loeb sack
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Lofgren
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Bonamici	Esty	Lowe y
Boyle, Brendan F.	Farr	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Lynch
Brown (FL)	Foster	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Bustos	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Gabbard	Matsui
Capps	Galleo	McCollum
Capuano	Garamendi	McDermott
Cárdenas	Graham	McGovern
Carney	Grayson	McNerney
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	Meeks
Cartwright	Grijalva	Meng
Castor (FL)	Gutiérrez	Moore
Castro (TX)	Hahn	Moulton
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Murphy (FL)
Cicilline	Heck (WA)	Nadler
Clark (MA)	Higgins	Napolitano
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Neal
Clay	Hinojosa	Nolan
Cleaver	Holiva	Norcross
Clyburn	Hoyer	O'Rourke
Cohen	Huffman	Pallone
Connolly	Israel	Pascarell
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Cooper	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Crowley	Kaptur	Pingree
Cuellar	Keating	Pocan
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Quigley
DeFazio	Kilmer	Rangel
DeGette	Kind	Rice (NY)
Delaney	Kuster	Richmond
DeLauro	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DelBene		Ruiz

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—236

Abraham	Cook	Granger
Allen	Cooper	Grayson
Amodei	Courtney	Griffith
Ashford	Cramer	Grothman
Barletta	Crawford	Guthrie
Barr	Crenshaw	Hahn
Barton	Culberson	Hardy
Beatty	Cummings	Harper
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Harris
Bilirakis	Davis, Danny	Heck (WA)
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Herrera Beutler
Black	DelBene	Higgins
Blackburn	Dent	Himes
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Hinojosa
Bonamici	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Boustany	Deutch	Huffman
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Brat	Dingell	Hurt (VA)
Bridenstine	Doggett	Issa
Brooks (AL)	Doyle, Michael F.	Johnson (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Brown (FL)	Duncan (TN)	Jolly
Bustos	Edwards	Kaptur
Butterfield	Ellison	Katko
Byrne	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Engel	Kennedy
Capps	Eshoo	Kildee
Cárdenas	Farenthold	King (IA)
Carney	Farr	King (NY)
Carter (TX)	Fattah	Kline
Castro (TX)	Fincher	Knight
Chabot	Fleischmann	Kuster
Chu, Judy	Fortenberry	Labrador
Cicilline	Foster	LaMalfa
Clark (MA)	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Garamendi	Latta
Cole	Goodlatte	Lieu, Ted
Collins (NY)	Gosar	Lipinski
Comstock	Graham	Loeb sack
		Lofgren

Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

Pascarell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohy
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson

Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—175

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Bass
Benishke
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crowley
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Esty
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxo
Fudge
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (IA)
Graves (MO)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Lance
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Pallone

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poliquin
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Sires
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert

Tonko

NOT VOTING—18

Blum
Carson (IN)
Conyers
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Kirkpatrick
Lewis

Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
McKinley
Meng
Payne

Pingree
Pitts
Scott (VA)
Slaughter
Wasserman
Schultz
Welch

□ 1512

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS, THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL, AND EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR OFFICIAL CONGRESSIONAL EVENTS SURROUNDING THE VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on House Administration and Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 43, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 43

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS.—The Capitol Grounds may be used for official Congressional events surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on Thursday, September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.—The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to enforce the restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds in connection with the events authorized by this section.

(c) EVENT PREPARATIONS.—The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the events authorized by this section.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF ROTUNDA FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

The rotunda of the United States Capitol is authorized to be used for ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Adminis-

tration of the Senate may jointly designate. Physical preparations for the conduct of such ceremonies and activities shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENTS SURROUNDING VISIT OF HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol on September 24, 2015, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate. Physical preparations for the conduct of such ceremonies and activities shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

SEC. 4. ARRANGEMENTS WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.

In carrying out their duties under this concurrent resolution, the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are each authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under such arrangements as each may enter into with the heads of those departments and agencies in connection with the ceremonies and activities surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 2028.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2028.

Will the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1515

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 29, 2015, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 22, line 7.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF NEVADA

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$75,000,000)”.

Page 25, lines 13 and 16, after each dollar amount, insert “(reduced to \$0)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Chair, my amendment builds on the committee's work to support scientific research and development within the Department of Energy.

More than 30 years have elapsed since Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, and over that time, technology and scientific knowledge have evolved significantly. However, Congress still clings to outdated technology and policy prescriptions to address today's nuclear waste issues.

The fact is that dumping our country's highly radioactive nuclear waste in a hole and hoping for the best is a 20th century solution. Instead, we must encourage the use of 21st century technology to address this issue. My amendment eliminates the money earmarked for the Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Geological Repository and increases funding for the Nuclear Energy University Program within DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy so that we can better support our scientists and universities as they work to develop a 21st century solution to this problem.

According to CBO, this amendment decreases budget authority by \$75 million and has no net impact on budget outlays. The Nuclear Energy University Program is authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Pursuant to these authorities, DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy allocates up to 20 percent of its R&D to university-based programs and mission-supporting R&D and related infrastructure improvements each year.

The funds provided by my amendment will be used by the Office of Nuclear Energy to support the Nuclear Energy University Program and the efforts by our universities to research and develop ways to reduce the radiotoxicity of nuclear waste, better recycle and reuse spent nuclear fuel, and ultimately provide a 21st century solution to our nuclear waste problem.

For instance, grants provided through the Nuclear Energy University Program to the University of Nevada-

Las Vegas College of Sciences help support and maintain a world-class radiochemistry program at UNLV that is currently working to reduce the radiotoxicity of nuclear waste. In fact, the technology available to students at UNLV is so advanced that scientists working at the national laboratories often use the facilities at UNLV to conduct experiments in the field of radiochemistry.

Strengthening and supporting the research and innovations already taking place at UNLV and other universities throughout the country to solve our Nation's nuclear waste problem is a much wiser investment of Federal resources than the flawed Yucca Mountain proposal. Instead of continuing the outdated, unworkable, one-State-must-lose-for-49-States-to-win approach to this problem, why don't we invest in the development of research and technology that will allow every State to win?

For Nevada and other States throughout the country, the 21st century solution proposed by this amendment has the potential to create countless new high-paying R&D jobs by utilizing existing regional technological capabilities. It is time we stopped subscribing to 20th century ideas that waste taxpayer resources by trying to sweep our nuclear waste problems under a very expensive rug and instead invest in American innovation and ingenuity to develop solutions that will make our country a leader in the field of nuclear energy once again.

I urge my colleagues to embrace the future of nuclear waste disposal, support my amendment to help create jobs, and restore the United States role as a leader in science and technology development.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and him offering the amendment, and I appreciate his point of view and why he is offering it, but this amendment would eliminate \$150 million in the bill for the Department of Energy to reorganize its adjudicatory response team and get the Yucca Mountain licensing process back on track and running.

Yucca Mountain is the law of the land. You have to remember that. Yucca Mountain is the law of the land, even though the administration has failed to follow that law. It has seen overwhelming support in countless numbers of votes and countless numbers of times in the House and is the only permanent repository option we have on the table.

This amendment would put in jeopardy the more than \$15 billion—let me repeat that, the more than \$15 billion—that has been spent so far on this program.

Once the Yucca Mountain application is finished, all Members of this body

and the Senate will have the opportunity to decide whether to move forward to construct and use the facility, but killing the process at this point, I think, is shortsighted, even though I understand the gentleman's concern.

I, therefore, urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), \$605,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$120,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$45,000,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$45,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It is designed to reduce wasteful spending, which I think we all would like to do around here.

This year Republican appropriators increased taxpayer-funded fossil fuel research and development by \$45 million above the President's request. My amendment would simply reduce the funding for the Office of Fossil Energy by \$45 million, down to the President's requested level, and then dedicate these funds to the spending reduction account, which is something that I think all of us want to do, given how much we talk about wasteful spending and deficit reduction around here.

The five most profitable oil companies—Exxon Mobil, Shell, Chevron, BP, ConocoPhillips—together made more than a trillion in profits last decade. A trillion dollars of profit; I think that is pretty good. Fossil fuels are reaping \$550 billion a year in subsidies, four times the amount of \$120 billion paid out in incentives for renewable energy. So fossil fuels are not getting the short shrift.

Air pollution from fossil fuels costs money. Nationwide the hidden health costs of electricity generated by fossil fuels adds up to as much as \$886 billion annually, or about 6 percent of gross domestic product. I am from Minnesota, and I live in north Minneapolis, and I can tell you, Madam Chair, that children there suffer greater rates of asthma than the rest of the State, partially as a result of emissions from vehicles that run on fossil fuels.

Climate change costs money, too. Climate change will make our electricity costs go up. Greenhouse-gas-driven changes in temperature will likely increase demand for electricity. This will make it necessary for construction of up to 95 gigawatts of new power generation over the next 5 to 25 years.

Residential and commercial ratepayers will pay up to \$12 billion more per year, and people living in coastal communities could pay as much as \$35 billion a year within the next 15 years because of sea level rise and hurricane activity.

Conclusion: let's lower the deficit; let's cut wasteful spending; let's stop wasting taxpayer money on dirty fossil fuel resources that cost all of us a lot more in the long term.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is almost humorous to listen to someone who wants to reduce the deficit and put this money into the deficit reduction account but then complains that we are following sequestration, and it is just too low and too crazy, and we need to do away with sequestration. We need to be able to spend more money.

The reality is, it is not that it is the deficit reduction account; it is that it is out of the fossil fuel program, which is more than what the President recommended. The administration has priorities, and Congress has priorities. This bill reflects the priorities of the subcommittee and the full committee that brought it to the floor. The amendment would reduce funding for the fossil energy account by \$45 million in favor of deficit spending.

Fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by the Nation's homes and businesses. Fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by the Nation's homes and businesses and will continue to provide for the majority of our energy needs for the foreseeable future.

The bill rejects the administration's proposed reductions to the fossil energy program, particularly the drastic cuts to the coal program, which is cut by \$31 million in the budget request, and instead funds these programs at \$605 million, a \$34 million increase over last year. With this additional funding, the Office of Fossil Energy will target

research into how water can be more efficiently used in power plants, how coal can be used to produce electric power through fuel cells, and how to efficiently capture and store carbon from our abundant natural resources.

This amendment would reduce funding for a program that ensures we use our Nation's fossil fuel resources as well and as cleanly as possible. Let me repeat. Fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, provide nearly 85 percent of the energy used by our Nation's homes and businesses, and will continue to provide for the majority of our energy needs in the foreseeable future.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, do I have time remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, surely my friend and I can join together on the spending reduction account on this particular measure. It is not that much money in the scope of this big event. The fact is, we should all be trying to reduce the deficit where we can, particularly when we are talking about industries that have combined profits of a trillion dollars. A trillion.

I do not think my constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of Minnesota need to foot the bill for R&D for Exxon Mobil, Shell, Chevron, BP, and ConocoPhillips. I think they should pay their own R&D if they are banking money like that. I think they are doing just fine, and they don't need more of the average taxpayer's dough.

Let me also say that we are already giving the fossil fuel industry \$550 billion a year in subsidies. Isn't that enough? Can't they live with a little less, given that they are making a trillion dollars in combined profits? We are giving them \$550 billion in subsidies, and they want more, and they just cannot possibly do with \$45 million less than we are giving them already?

I have got to tell you, I have just got a feeling that if they don't get this extra money, they will be fine. I feel ConocoPhillips and Chevron will somehow make it if they don't get our American taxpayers' \$45 million.

□ 1530

I urge a very strong "yes" in favor of this amendment for deficit reduction and to end a little bit of corporate welfare.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. The reality is ExxonMobil, all of the other companies you named, don't get this money. This money goes into research, research that fuels 85 percent of the electrical needs in this country—research.

Now, you could also say: If you are going to do that, why not take away all the money that goes into renewable energy research? Why not take away all the money that goes into wind power or into solar power or into nuclear

power or into any of the other research that we do?

It is just that some people can't fathom the fact that 85 percent—that is getting close to 100—but 85 percent of our energy is produced by fossil fuel. While the gentleman talks about deficit reduction, the reality is I think he just wants to take some money out of the fossil fuel research account.

I will be interested, being so interested in deficit reduction, how the vote comes later on with the Republican budget that will be before the House later on, so I will be watching that very closely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

For Department of Energy expenses necessary to carry out naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities, \$17,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds remaining from prior years shall be available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$212,030,000, to remain available until expended.

NORTHEAST HOME HEATING OIL RESERVE

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve storage, operation, and management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), \$7,600,000, to remain available until expended.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, \$117,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$229,193,000, to remain available until expended.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out uranium enrichment

facility decontamination and decommissioning, remedial actions, and other activities of title II of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, \$625,000,000, to be derived from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, to remain available until expended, of which \$32,959,000 shall be available in accordance with title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

SCIENCE

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for science activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and purchase of not more than 17 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one ambulance and one bus, \$5,100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$181,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,500,000)”.

Page 51, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$25,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an important amendment that ensures that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is appropriately funded to meet its core mission. The NRC's work is vital to the energy picture of our Nation, and safety remains and always will be the number one priority.

The NRC is funded in two ways: 10 percent of its budget comes from appropriated funds from the taxpayers; and, secondly, 90 percent of the fees are collected from the nuclear industry.

While I am a strong supporter of nuclear power and safety, the NRC budget has grown dramatically in the last decade from \$669 million per year in 2005 to the current level of over \$1 billion this year. Herein lies the problem.

This chart lays out the picture that we face today with the NRC. Under the NRC's 2005 budget, there were 3,108 employees responsible for oversight on 104 reactors and the review of 1,500 licensing actions. In their fiscal year 2016 budget request of \$1.032 billion, the NRC called for 3,754 employees to oversee 100 reactors and review 900 licensing actions.

In summary, the number of reactors has gone down by 4 percent; the number of licensing actions has gone down by 40 percent; the number of employees has gone up by 21 percent, and the budget has grown by 54 percent.

Madam Chair, only in Washington does the staff and the cost grow while

the workload goes down. The historical increases in both funding and staff resources occurred in anticipation of new reactors being built under a nuclear renaissance for our country.

Unfortunately, due to increasing bureaucratic red tape and other market conditions, the work never materialized; thus, a shrinking nuclear industry has faced an ever-growing regulator over the past 10 years. Only in Washington, as I said before, does the bureaucracy grow while the workload shrinks.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission even admits that it needs to downsize. In its February 2015 report entitled, “Project Aim 2020,” they said the same thing. Additionally, the NRC has 60 rulemakings underway, and they are collecting additional fees from existing reactors to make up for lost licensing revenue. These fees are ultimately paid by hard-working American families in their electricity bills.

My amendment is simple. It reduces funding by \$25 million, or about 2.5 percent, and would right-size the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to meet its core mission and safely regulate our existing nuclear fleet.

The industry share of support, or 90 percent of that, would be reduced by \$22.5 million, and the Federal share of \$2.5 would be redirected to basic research in DOE's Office of Science in order to develop future American energy solutions.

Madam Chair, in the last few minutes, I have had the opportunity to have great discussions with Chairman SIMPSON, and I am confident that he is aware of this issue and has taken steps to do this. He said he would work with me in the future to continue addressing this issue. I am raising this today, but I will be withdrawing my amendment.

I would like to thank Chairman SIMPSON for his efforts to address this issue and for agreeing to work with me on the issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to thank the gentleman for being dogged on this issue. We share his concern. We had a great hearing with all the commissioners of the NRC. They also understand this concern. It was the Aim Project 2020 that they put together that realized that they have too many staff and they need to reduce it. They want to do it in a responsible way.

In the full committee, we adopted an amendment to reduce their budget by \$25 million. That is in addition to the fact that they had carryover fund that they could have spent last year that they won't have available this year.

Their budget is going down; whether it is the right amount or not, we don't know yet, but we are going to keep on

this because we want them to reestablish their credibility in the world. They need to do that because they are a regulatory agency that is very important, and they do incredibly important work.

We are going to be holding hearings again on this next year when we do their budget to make sure they are following through on their commitment to reduce their size and scope, particularly the rulemaking authority that they have got out there. Many people believe they are writing far too many rules, and some believe it is because they have too many employees.

I appreciate the gentleman offering this amendment and the discussion and offering to withdraw the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would just say to the offerer of the amendment from Texas that I come from a part of the country where the Nuclear Regulatory Commission did not do its job for a long time.

I appreciate what you are attempting to do, and all I would say is, coming from a region where we have serious infractions that put human life at risk more than once, as you look at that budget and try to improve it, do not assume whatever levels of regulation existed in fact were appropriate because, in many cases, they were shortchanged and inadequate.

As you move forward in this important arena, I would urge you to look at the places in the country where mistakes happened and figure out why and then direct resources to where they are most important in this very important technology.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROKITA) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 5, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$239,749,000)”.

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$239,749,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to address an imbalance in our efforts to promote the long-term economic security interests of the United States.

This appropriations bill would underfund the Office of Science by almost \$240 million below the President's request for the next fiscal year. My amendment would correct this by bringing the Office of Science account up to the President's request level.

Investments in the DOE Office of Science and its laboratories have supported American innovation and discovery science at the forefront of the physical sciences and engineering.

It is impossible and unwise to ignore the value of our national labs. They have helped answer fundamental questions on how the universe works, supported breakthroughs in fields as diverse as medicine and astronomy and developments in industry that drive our economy.

Investments in our labs have led to the construction of accelerators and detectors that enable our scientists to discover new particles, including quarks and the Higgs boson, to help explain the nature of the universe in matter, energy, space, and time. Physicists have used their fundamental research to develop new technologies, including the PET scan, which is used every day to treat patients diagnosed with cancerous tumors.

The Office of Science has also supported the training of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers for more than 60 years. We need to maintain a competitive advantage now more than ever.

While the U.S. is reducing investments in Federal R&D, Europe and Asia have been increasing investments. In 1968, we spent 9.1 percent of the budget on research and development. Today, we are spending only 3.6 percent. If this trend continues, it won't be long before China's investments in R&D will far outpace our own.

The Office of Science is not only an important investment in our future, it is a valuable investment in our economy. Our national labs and the major user facilities housed at those labs are some of the greatest tools we have to offer researchers and industry. They are also important contractors to the local economy. The economic impacts of Argonne and Fermilab in Illinois are estimated to be more than \$1.3 billion annually.

Those who seek to underfund and eliminate Federal programs often say that the private sector can do it better,

but, when it comes to fundamental scientific research, that simply is not an option. The Office of Science is responsible for building and maintaining research facilities, which many private companies rely on but are far too big for any single business or university to develop.

These user facilities, such as the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory, are a critical research tool to academics and industry alike. For example, Eli Lilly conducts nearly half of the research in their drug discovery portfolio at the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne, but the funding levels in this bill will threaten the Advanced Photon Source and other critical projects.

At a time of ongoing economic stress, we must continue to develop the next generation of the American technical workforce. As other world powers are growing and challenging our position as the global leader in science and innovation, we cannot let the number of American scientists and researchers or the quality of their research facilities diminish. Bringing the Office of Science budget up to the President's request is crucial to maintaining that quality.

I would also like to briefly discuss the offset, which is the NNSA weapons activities account. It is important for us to recognize that we need to strike the right balance between defending our country today and investing in scientific research for the future.

□ 1545

I would argue that maintaining an advantage as the global leader in science and technology makes us much more secure than amassing and maintaining excessive numbers of nuclear weapons.

Madam Chairman, I rise today because we must continue to invest in American innovation and fully fund the research and development conducted through the DOE Office of Science.

I understand that the majority party has the power to block that funding and that there will be a point of order pending against this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-425), including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be made available to affected units of local government, as defined in section 2(31) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C.

10101(31)), to support the Yucca Mountain geologic repository, as authorized by such Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$150,000,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$150,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I come to the floor today on behalf of the people of Nevada to ask my colleagues to reject the failed policies of the past and concentrate our efforts on real solutions to the Nation's energy challenges.

The bill before us appropriates \$150 million for the failed Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste project. Taxpayer-funded junkets and photo ops cannot change the fact that this project has never been based on sound science but, instead, stems from targeted politics.

After decades squandered and \$15 billion wasted, we are no closer to a solution than when President Reagan signed the “Screw Nevada” bill in 1988. Yet, today, the House is set to consider legislation that will waste millions more on this failed project.

Now, I have heard my colleagues say this is the law of the land. Well, the ACA is the law of the land, and that hasn't stopped them from trying to overturn it 57 times. Furthermore, it appears that although this is the so-called law of the land, the interpretation of that law is pretty flexible.

I want to bring my colleagues' attention to a particular line in this bill that appropriates \$5 million for units of local government to support Yucca Mountain. This simply creates a slush fund to pay off local governments in return for their support of this failed project.

I don't anticipate that many of my colleagues are as familiar with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act as we are in Nevada, but the law clearly states that any benefits that the Federal Government may appropriate can only be provided through mutual agreement between the Federal Government and the State. Last time I checked, Republican Governor Brian Sandoval, not the House Appropriations Committee, is the chief executive of the State of Nevada, and he strongly opposes Yucca Mountain.

Madam Chairman, I will submit for the RECORD an op-ed written by Governor Sandoval and former Governor Richard Bryan, titled “Yucca Mountain: Unsafe site won't ever be safe for nuclear waste.”

[Special to the Review-Journal, Apr. 12, 2015]

**YUCCA MOUNTAIN: UNSAFE SITE WON'T EVER
BE SAFE FOR NUCLEAR WASTE**

(By Brian Sandoval and Richard Bryan)

Nevada Rep. Crescent Hardy, who joined a pro-Yucca Mountain congressional site visit this past week, recently asked the question, "Is there a scenario in which Nevadans would actually welcome nuclear waste storage at Yucca Mountain?" ("Time for Nevada to talk Yucca Mountain," March 22 Review-Journal).

The answer to that question is an emphatic "no" for one simple yet unavoidable reason: Because Yucca Mountain is an unsafe place for storing or disposing deadly nuclear waste and was selected for purely political reasons having nothing to do with science or suitability. There is nothing for state officials to negotiate. In fact, our leaders would be remiss in their duty to protect the public and the environment to entertain the notion that any amount of dollars could possibly compensate for likely grievous and lethal harm from siting a facility in such an unsafe location as Yucca Mountain.

From day one, science with respect to Yucca Mountain has taken a back seat to Washington, D.C., power politics.

In 1987, Congress ignored science completely and named Yucca Mountain as the only site to be studied as a potential repository in spite of its known serious flaws. Yucca was picked not because it was the best site or even a safe one. It was chosen solely because Nevada was the most politically vulnerable state at the time. Sites in Texas, Louisiana, Washington, and other states were dismissed out of hand because their states were protected by powerful Washington, D.C., politicians.

As site characterization at Yucca progressed, every time the science showed the site to be seriously flawed, the Energy Department merely invented another engineering fix—like the metal waste packages that will have to remain intact for 10,000 years or more, even though they've never been built or tested; more than 11,000 titanium drip shields that must be placed over the "corrosion-resistant" waste packages (DOE does not plan to install them for 100 years or more) in order to meet the radiation exposure criteria; and manipulating the site's boundaries so the aquifer below Yucca can be used to "dilute" the radiation that will inevitably escape from the repository.

And when even these "fixes" were not enough, the Energy Department simply abandoned its own siting criteria containing specific qualifying and disqualifying conditions (that Yucca couldn't meet) and created a black box-like assessment tool (called Total System Performance Assessment, or TSPA) that allows the site's many flaws to be camouflaged and rendered insignificant.

The way to fix the nuclear waste disposal problem is not to keep beating the dead horse that is Yucca Mountain, as Rep. John Shimkus, R-Ill., appeared to be doing with the promotional tour of the shut-down Yucca Mountain site last week. A more constructive and fruitful approach would be to move forward with new initiatives that rely on real science to identify safe and suitable storage and disposal sites and require states and local governments to give their consent to any future nuclear waste siting efforts.

Brian Sandoval, a Republican, is governor of Nevada. Richard Bryan, a Democrat, is a former Nevada governor and U.S. senator, and chairman of the Nevada Commission on Nuclear Projects.

Ms. TITUS. Also, the committee's report language sites that this hush money is provided for local govern-

ments that give "formal consent." This raises yet another question about the intent of this section. The law does not outline any process for giving formal consent, so how would the newly bribed localities be able to provide that consent?

If you are looking for consent, I urge you to support H.R. 1364, the Nuclear Waste Informed Consent Act, which I introduced, along with my colleague Congressman HECK and Senators REID and HELLER. This bipartisan legislation sets out a formal consent process so that Nevada or Texas or New Mexico or any other State and affected local community or tribe that chooses to host a nuclear waste depository will have a process by which it can give consent for siting by the Federal Government. No community should have to face what we in Nevada have faced for the last few decades of having this pushed down our throat.

Madam Chairman, I will also submit for the RECORD two articles outlining nuclear waste storage proposals that are supported in the State of Texas and the State of New Mexico.

[West Texas Radio, Feb. 13, 2015]

**COMPANY WANTS TO EXPAND NUCLEAR WASTE
SITE IN TEXAS**

(By Travis Bubenik)

A Dallas-based company is looking to expand its nuclear waste site in rural West Texas into a longer-term storage site for high-level radioactive waste.

Waste Control Specialists (WCS) is asking the federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission to approve a new license to expand its above-ground storage facility in Andrews County to allow more radioactive types of waste.

The company already stores "low level" waste—contaminated rags, tools and other equipment that have come mostly from the national nuclear research lab in Los Alamos, New Mexico.

The site also served as a home for waste that was supposed to wind up at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico, until that site was shuttered after a leak contaminated workers there about a year ago.

WCS now wants to store used fuel rods from nuclear power plants across the country—a more radioactive form of waste.

In theory, the waste would stay in West Texas temporarily—until the federal government comes up with a long-term disposal plan—but it could be decades before that happens.

"Even though it is called an interim storage facility, that storage period is a long time," says WCS President Rod Baltzer. "We think that's somewhere between 60 to 100 years."

Baltzer was in Washington, D.C. Monday talking to reporters about the company's push to expand the facility.

"This wasn't initially something we intended to do when we got out there, but we've been out there a long time, and times have changed," he says.

Those changes have riled some environmentalists in Texas.

The Sierra Club has criticized the company for its track record of slowly expanding its intentions for the West Texas site. The environmental group says the company's misled lawmakers and the public as it's sought to store more radioactive types of waste through the years.

Cyrus Reed, Conservation Director for the Sierra Club's Lone Star Chapter, says he's

watched with concern while the company's plan for the site grew from storing low level waste to larger quantities of the same waste.

"Now it turns out we are to become the nation's dumping ground for all manner of dangerous highly toxic radioactive waste," he says.

WCS maintains it can store the waste safely, and that the community in Andrews County has welcomed the idea.

Baltzer says the company is fulfilling the Obama Administration's call in 2013 for a "consent-based" approach to transporting, storing and disposing of the nation's nuclear waste.

That strategy instructs the government to seek out communities willing to house nuclear waste "in expectation of the economy activity that would result from the siting, construction and operation of such a facility in their communities."

For now, Andrews County appears to be that kind of place. County Commissioners recently passed a resolution enthusiastically backing the plan.

If the Nuclear Regulatory Commission gives WCS the green light, the company says construction on the expanded facility could be complete by the end of 2020.

[From the Associated Press, Apr. 30, 2015]

**NEW MEXICO JOINS RACE TO BUILD STORAGE
FOR NUCLEAR WASTE**

(By Susan Montoya Bryan)

Two rural New Mexico counties announced Wednesday they're partnering with an international firm in the race to build an interim storage facility to house spent nuclear fuel that has been piling up at reactors around the nation.

Officials from Lea and Eddy counties and Holtec International gathered at the National Museum of Nuclear Science and History in Albuquerque to outline their plans.

John Heaton, a former state lawmaker and chairman of the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance, a consortium of city and county governments, said there's no better place in the U.S. than southeastern New Mexico to build such a facility since the region is already home to a multibillion-dollar uranium enrichment plant and the federal government's only underground nuclear waste repository.

Heaton acknowledged that in vetting the project, safety was the top priority.

The region is still rebounding from the indefinite closure of the government's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, where a chemical reaction inside a drum of waste resulted in a radiation release in February 2014. The U.S. Department of Energy has said it will take years and more than a half-billion dollars before the repository resumes full operations.

The proposed storage facility would be designed to handle spent nuclear fuel from power plants, not the kind of defense-related waste that was shipped to WIPP.

Holtec CEO and President Kris Singh said his company has spent more than a decade developing technology to ensure the safe storage of spent fuel inside triple-lined stainless steel casks that are capable of enduring the force of a freight train collision or an earthquake.

"We became convinced that this is an extraordinary, safe process that needs to occur in this country," Heaton said.

Federal officials acknowledged that the future of nuclear energy in the U.S. depends on the ability to manage and dispose of used nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

In March, the DOE announced it would begin siting interim storage sites as part of its plan to spur the use of nuclear power and develop the transportation and storage infrastructure needed to manage the waste.

Some members of Congress have shown renewed interest in the mothballed Yucca Mountain project in Nevada.

In West Texas, Waste Control Specialists announced plans earlier this year to build a temporary storage facility that would eventually be capable of holding up to 40,000 metric tons.

Yucca Mountain was designed with a cap of 70,000 metric tons. The proposed facility in southeastern New Mexico would hold even more.

The agreement between Holtec and the Eddy-Lea Energy Alliance addresses the design, licensing, construction and operation of an underground storage site on 32 acres between the communities of Carlsbad and Hobbs.

Holtec officials say the company expects to apply for a permit from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission within a year. State permits would also be required. Licensing could take three years.

"It's a tough road to get any nuclear project off the ground, otherwise we would have repositories and interim storage facilities all over the country," Heaton said. "We have great partners and the will to get it done."

Gov. Susana Martinez weighed in earlier this month. She sent a letter to Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz as a preliminary endorsement of the proposal.

Watchdogs have raised concerns, pointing to transportation issues and the possibility that New Mexico could become a permanent repository for such waste. Supporters said Wednesday they would have to work with communities along the transportation routes, just as they did when setting up the network for shipping waste to WIPP.

Holtec officials were reluctant to put a price tag on the venture, but Heaton said it could involve anywhere from \$200 million to \$400 million in capital costs.

The revenue the storage facility could bring in for the counties and the state would ultimately depend on how big of a share of the market Holtec could attract, Singh said.

Ms. TITUS. So I would say, Madam Chairman, instead of wasting tens of millions of dollars more on an unworkable solution, let's, instead, meet our fiduciary obligations to future generations. At the same time, let us commit to moving forward on a new policy to address the Nation's nuclear waste, one that relies on a consent-based system that doesn't force waste on communities like mine, which is the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and send a message that Congress will not continue to move backwards but will take serious action to address our Nation's nuclear waste policy.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I understand the lady's passion for this, but some of the rhetoric, quite frankly, isn't accurate.

When she calls it a failed policy, it is only a failed policy politically because this administration came into office on a promise of not doing Yucca Mountain because they needed electoral votes

from the State of Nevada. That is the reality.

The fact is we have spent over \$15 billion on this project, and the fact is it is the law of the land. Until you change that law of the land, it remains the law of the land.

Whether it is safe or not, I don't know. I am not a scientist. But what I do know is there has been 52—I think it is 52—National Academy of Sciences studies on all sorts of aspects. This is the most studied piece of earth on the Earth. In fact, I have suggested during a hearing with the Department that if we ultimately decide not to do Yucca Mountain, they shouldn't close that down because they are going to need a space that big to put all the papers from the studies that we have done on Yucca Mountain. That is the reality.

I think we all understand my colleague's opposition to Yucca Mountain. I don't blame her. I know she is from Nevada. But I can't support this amendment. This amendment would eliminate \$150 million in the bill for the Department of Energy to reorganize its adjudicatory response team and get the Yucca Mountain licensing process back up and running. Otherwise, more than \$15 billion which has been spent on this program will truly be wasted.

Once that application is finished, all Members of this body, all Members of this body and the Senate will have the opportunity to decide whether to move forward, to construct and use the facility. But killing the process at this point, I think, would be very shortsighted. I therefore urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by my colleague, but he does not address the points I make about how this amendment looks at provisions of the bill that are contrary to the new proposal.

I urge a "no" vote. There is no point in throwing good money after bad. American taxpayers deserve a wiser expenditure of their dollars. Nevadans deserve to be heard on this issue, and those areas that want to have a site in their State or their community deserve a chance to be considered.

I thank you, and I urge, strongly, a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), the vice chairman of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee and the chairman

for acting to impose greater discipline on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

We know that the future of nuclear power in the United States depends on having a credible nuclear safety regulator and depends on the industry continuing to perform at a high level of safety. We feel strongly that the agency must continue its core mission of protecting the public health and safety, but the NRC must do so in a manner that does not add to the economic headwinds that the industry faces.

Thanks to the scientific breakthroughs and renewed interest in nuclear energy, our Nation has an incredible opportunity to develop new sources of power that can provide affordable and reliable energy. I hope that the NRC can work with industry to seize these opportunities, while fulfilling its mission to ensure public safety.

I support the committee's direction to require the NRC's rulemaking process to be commission-driven in order to provide greater discipline, transparency, efficiency, and accountability.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—
ENERGY

For Department of Energy expenses necessary in carrying out the activities authorized by section 5012 of the America COMPETES Act (Public Law 110-69), \$280,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$28,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF
CALIFORNIA

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of Mr. SCHIFF of California and Mr. POLIS of Colorado, which would increase funding for the Advanced Research Project Agency-Energy, also known as ARPA-E. Mr. SCHIFF offered this same exact amendment last year, and it passed the House with bipartisan support. I hope the House will vote in support of it again.

Like the House's mark last year, the underlying bill this year provides \$280

million for ARPA-E, which is \$45 million below the President's request. This amendment would increase funding for ARPA-E by \$20 million, with the offset taken from the Department administration.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for providing at least level funding for ARPA-E this year, which is a substantial improvement from last year, which cut the program by as much as 80 percent over previous years.

However, I think that rather than providing flat funding, we should be stepping up our commitment to a potentially game-changing research program, and that is exactly what this amendment does.

This is a very modest investment for an agency whose work is helping to reshape our economy. While the amendment would leave us still short of where the funding should be and where it is in the President's budget, passing it would send a strong signal that there is bipartisan support for this kind of research.

Started in 2009, ARPA-E is a revolutionary program that advances high-potential, high-impact energy technologies that are too early for private sector investment. ARPA-E projects have the potential to radically improve U.S. economic security, national security, and environmental well-being as well.

ARPA-E empowers America's energy researchers with funding, technical assistance, and market readiness. ARPA-E is modeled after the highly successful Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or DARPA, which has produced groundbreaking inventions for the Department of Defense and the Nation, perhaps most notably the Internet itself. A key element of both Agencies is that managers are limited to fixed terms, so new blood continuously revitalizes this research portfolio.

As we cut spending to return the budget to balance, we must not weaken those programs that are vital to our economic future and national security, and ARPA-E is such an agency. Even if we can't make the investment that the President has called for in his budget, let's be sure that we don't hinder an agency that is pointing the way to a more energy-secure future.

Energy is a national security issue; it is an economic imperative; it is a health concern; and it is an environmental necessity. Investing wisely in this type of research going on at ARPA-E is exactly the direction we should be going as a nation.

We want to lead the energy revolution. We don't want to see this advantage go to China or anywhere else in the world. If we are serious about staying at the forefront of the energy revolution, we must continue to fully invest in the kind of cutting-edge work that ARPA-E performs. By providing the funding I am recommending today, we will send a clear signal of the seri-

ousness of our intent to remain world leaders in energy.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim time reluctantly. I happen to be one who thinks the ARPA-E does some good work. My biggest problem is that, as I said last night on either the first or second amendment that was offered to this bill, they took money out of departmental administration to fund something, and then another one to take money out of departmental administration. So far we have taken out about \$50 million out of a \$245 million budget for the departmental administration.

It is easy to vote that way because who wants to pay for the administrative costs? Yet we are going to have to deal with that when we get into conference to make sure that they have adequate funding in the Department for the administrative work.

□ 1600

So at some point in time, I have to say I can't support continuing to take money out of the departmental administration in order to fund a variety of programs, even though some of them may be very worthwhile.

And while I, myself, am not opposed to ARPA-E and think they do some good work, the reality is, you have to balance this bill.

We have got ARPA-E down \$266 million from what it was last year and substantially below what the President requested, but we had other priorities that we had to fund. And the other thing I had to consider is that the Science and Technology Committee—that is, the authorizing committee that does much of this work—has marked up a bill in their committee that substantially reduces the overall funding authorization for ARPA-E. So that causes me some concern.

While I may or may not agree with their markup—I don't know; we will see when that hits the floor—that is the reason that I am going to oppose this amendment.

Other than that, I understand what the gentleman is trying to do and the concern that many people have for the decrease in funding in ARPA-E.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE 17 INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

Such sums as are derived from amounts received from borrowers pursuant to section 1702(b) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 under this heading in prior Acts, shall be collected in accordance with section 502(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided*, That, for necessary administrative expenses to carry out this Loan Guarantee program, \$42,000,000 is appropriated, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided further*, That \$25,000,000 of the fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account to cover administrative expenses and shall remain available until expended, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$17,000,000: *Provided further*, That fees collected under section 1702(h) in excess of the amount appropriated for administrative expenses shall not be available until appropriated: *Provided further*, That the Department of Energy shall not subordinate any loan obligation to other financing in violation of section 1702 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 or subordinate any Guaranteed Obligation to any loan or other debt obligations in violation of section 609.10 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY VEHICLES MANUFACTURING LOAN PROGRAM

For Department of Energy administrative expenses necessary in carrying out the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program, \$6,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), \$247,420,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$30,000, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total \$117,171,000 in fiscal year 2016 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$130,249,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$31,297,000 is for Energy Policy and Systems Analysis.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, let me begin by thanking Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for the work that they have done, a very challenging and popular appropriations when it comes to energy and water and also the issues of the environment.

I have a very simple amendment that reinforces our commitment to communities from rural America to urban America, from hamlets and villages to large urban centers. And it simply emphasizes a quality of life: for all Americans to have a good, clean environment; to reduce asthma in children; to help senior citizens; and to have a good quality of life in their sunset years, in their older homes, in older communities, of which I represent, is an important funding necessity for this Nation.

I want to emphasize the work that has been done and remind my colleagues—for those of us who had the privilege of being here—that President Clinton issued an executive order directing Federal agencies to address the disproportionately high and adverse human health environmental impacts on minority and low-income populations, which covered rural America, which oftentimes experienced the impact of the environment.

We have worked over the years to improve their quality of life, and today I ask that we continue to do so.

In particular, I want to refer to a project in Houston, Texas, called the CAS site. That site was attempted to be cleaned up. It is in an older neighborhood, Madam Chair. Senior citizens own their homes. They have been there for a long time.

There have been a lot of machinations about this entity that is espousing chemicals, leaking chemicals because it is old and closed down and abandoned. And we had to call upon the environmental justice sector in the Federal Government to provide the leverage to help these senior citizens, people who did not want to move from their homes.

I walked those streets, went into the backyards of senior citizens and saw the seepage coming out of the ground and, as well, coming in from the property on the back side.

Environmental justice is a good thing, and it is through those efforts that we are working with the EPA to give hope to these citizens that they can stay in their homes.

I live in the energy capital of the world. It is a job-creator. But on occasions, in the midst of our wetlands and our areas of pristine, if you will, environmental assets, we have some ups and downs.

Just recently, I flew over the Houston port at the time of a spillage that

was impacting some of our most environmentally important areas, including wetlands and areas that are protected or are important to the environment and to the quality of life.

So I am asking that the Jackson Lee amendment be accepted for the importance of providing for the continued support of environmental justice and equality for areas that are both urban and rural.

Let me finish by making this statement, Madam Chair.

This is an important cause because, as we look at the funds that are dealing with environmental justice, they increase youth involvement through science, technology, engineering, and math. They also help to promote clean energy, weatherization, cleanup, asset revitalization, and they help my constituents and the constituents of so many in this body whose older neighborhoods are sometimes impacted by older entities that are left behind in the neighborhood where seniors continue to live. I want to be able to walk those neighborhoods and make sure that my seniors can stay in their homes—small frame homes—and make sure that as they stay in their frame homes, that they will have the quality of life that all of us would like.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member. This is a tough job to do. And I would like to emphasize the importance of the funding for environmental justice and helping to continue, if you will, to put focus and emphasis on quality of life for homeowners, seniors, and people living in rural America and urban America.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for shepherding this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

My amendment increases funding for DOE departmental administration by \$1,000,000 which should be used to enhance the Department's Environmental Justice Program activities.

Madam Chair, the Environmental Justice Program is an essential tool in the effort to improve the lives of low-income and minority communities as well as the environment at large.

Twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing Federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

A healthy environment sustains a productive and healthy community which fosters personal and economic growth.

Maintaining funds for environmental justice that go to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Minority-Serving Institutions, Tribal Colleges, and other organizations is imperative to protecting sustainability and growth of the community and environment.

The funding of these programs is vital to ensuring that minority groups are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environ-

ment and the continued preservation of their homes.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

IMPORTANCE OF DOE'S ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Funds that would be awarded to this important cause would increase youth involvement in STEM fields and also promote clean energy, weatherization, clean-up, and asset revitalization. These improvements would provide protection to our most vulnerable groups.

This program provides better access to technology for underserved communities. Together, the Department of Energy and Department of Agriculture have distributed over 5,000 computers to low-income populations.

The Community Leaders Institute is another vital component of the Environmental Justice Program. It ensures that those in leadership positions understand what is happening in their communities and can therefore make informed decisions in regards to their communities.

In addition to promoting environmental sustainability, CLI also brings important factors including public health and economic development into the discussion for community leaders.

The CLI program has been expanded to better serve Native Americans and Alaska Natives, which is a prime example of how various other minority groups can be assisted as well.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefited by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. The DOE also works to increase low-income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

Since 2002, the Tribal Energy Program has also funded 175 energy projects amounting to over \$41.8 million in order to help tribes invest in renewable sources of energy.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

In fiscal year 2013, the environmental justice program was not funded.

For fiscal year 2016, we ask that money be appropriated for the continuation of this vital initiative.

We must help our low-income and minority communities and ensure equality for those who are most vulnerable in our country.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment for the Environmental Justice Program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978,

\$46,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$8,713,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$92,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mrs. BLACK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON.
RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL
YEAR 2016

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 29, 2015, at page H2516.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking everyone involved in getting us to this moment, where we have an agreement between the House and the Senate Budget conferees on a joint balanced budget proposal before the Congress.

All members of our committee and the conference committee and their

staffs should be commended for their hard work. And I want to commend specifically the staff directors on both sides of the aisle. Rick May on the Republican side and Tom Kahn on the Democratic side worked yeoman's service in making certain that their respective Members were prepared for the activity that we have gone through over the past 4 months.

We are set, Mr. Speaker, to adopt the first balanced budget of this kind in over a decade. That is important not only from an historical perspective but also for what it says about this Congress' commitment to doing the work that the American people sent us here to do, to get it done, to move forward with positive solutions for a healthier economy and a stronger, more secure nation.

□ 1615

What we have before us today, Mr. Speaker, is a budget that balances within 10 years without raising taxes and reduces spending over \$5 trillion over that period of time, which will not only get Washington's fiscal house in order, but pave the way for stronger economic growth, more jobs, and more opportunity.

It invests in our Nation's priorities, ensures a strong national defense, and saves, strengthens, and protects important programs like Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I know our friends on the other side of the aisle, we will hear from them, and they may have a difference of opinion. If past is prologue, we are bound to hear from them a few items that they will talk about. They will say that our budget will, in their words, "hurt the middle class." That statement bears no resemblance to reality, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, what is hurting the middle class right now are the policies of our Democrat friends and President Obama that they have put in place, policies that have led to the worst economic recovery in the modern era, stagnant wages and underwhelming growth in our economy. We just heard today, Mr. Speaker, that the economy grew in the first quarter by 0.2 percent. There is a reason for that.

What we need to do is to get the economy rolling. The best thing we can do for the middle class—for hard-working American families—is to get our economy turned around so more jobs are being created and more dreams are being realized.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker. Our budget does just that through responsible reforms that make government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable by lifting the oppressive regulatory regime here in Washington off the backs of job creators and entrepreneurs and by fundamentally reforming our Tax Code so it is simpler, fairer, and American companies can better compete more effectively in the global economy.

By doing all of that, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office tells us

that we will rein in deficits and lower government spending which will have a positive, long-term impact on the economy as well as the budget, benefits like increases in the pool of national savings and investment which would allow for more growth, job creation, and more economic security.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of attacking our efforts to save, strengthen, and protect programs like Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Why some folks here in Washington would be willing to let these programs go bankrupt is beyond me. Medicare and Social Security are going broke. That is not according to me. That is according to the trustees of the programs.

Medicaid is not working for patients or the doctors who would like to be able to serve them. The status quo is unsustainable, and doing nothing is indefensible. We can save these programs and improve them. We have to do so for the sake of their beneficiaries and for future generations, and our budget does just that.

Further, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned before, our budget prioritizes the safety and security of the American people, channeling important resources to our men and women in uniform. We do so in a responsible way, in a manner consistent with current law, and without allowing further across-the-board cuts in defense spending.

There are those who criticize how we do that, and I respect that there are differences of opinion on this, but, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can all agree that, when we are faced with hugely complex national security threats and growing unrest around the world, what we need to do is to find a way to move forward to ensure that those protecting our lives and our freedom have the support and the training that they need.

I look forward to an open and honest debate about the vision we have put forward to get our Nation's fiscal house in order, to strengthen our Nation's defenses, to protect our most vulnerable citizens, and to ensure a healthier economy for all Americans because that is exactly what this budget agreement does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the agreement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong opposition to this budget conference report.

I do agree with the gentleman on one issue, which is that the staff of the Budget Committee on both sides, Republican and Democrat, have worked very hard; but, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the product that is brought before us today is the wrong direction for America.

We began with a House budget that was wrong for America, and we went to conference with a Senate budget that was wrong for America. It is not surprising, but it is still disappointing,

that we come to the floor today with a budget that is wrong for America.

Why do I say that? We are all entitled to our opinions, but we don't get to make up our own facts. The reality is, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the folks who are referees in this House, in this Congress, where people have competing opinions, they have said that this Republican budget will slow down the economy over the next couple of years.

It is right here on page 3 of their report. Real GNP, real economic growth per person, would be lowered by as much as 0.6 percent under the specified paths than under the baseline 2016 to 2018 CBO budget estimates.

Let's translate that. What that means is that, compared to what would happen in the economy without the Republican budget—if we didn't have this—this will make things worse. This will slow down economic growth. This means less economic growth per person in the United States of America. That is not me saying it, that is the nonpartisan budget experts saying it. So it is going to slow down economic growth, although we have good news, some good news in the economy, right. I mean, we have seen month after month now of positive economic growth. We would like to see the economy grow faster, and we would like to see it grow stronger, but we have seen over 61 consecutive months of positive economic growth. Why in the world would we want a budget that over the next couple of years slows down that economic growth, according to the Congressional Budget Office?

But it gets worse than that because one of the chronic problems we have seen in our economy, Mr. Speaker, over the last many years—not just 2 or 3 or 4, but over decades—is this phenomenon where Americans are working harder than ever and they are more productive than ever, but their paychecks are flat. Their take-home pay is flat.

You have rising worker productivity on the one hand; people are working harder than ever, but it is not translating into higher wages and benefits.

Back about 30 or 40 years ago—we had a chart with rising worker productivity—guess what else was rising with it? It was worker wages. But, over the last 30 years, we have seen people working harder than ever, and productivity has gone up, but wages for most Americans have been pretty flat in real terms.

The gain of that increased worker productivity has flowed dramatically and overwhelmingly to folks at the very top end of the economic ladder, and God bless them. But why would we want to bring a budget to the floor of the House that squeezes even tighter and harder the people who are working hard every day and not seeing their paychecks go up?

How does their budget make life harder for most Americans? First of all, Mr. Speaker, it increases taxes on

working families. They get rid of the bump up in the Child Tax Credit. They get rid of the strengthening of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

They eliminate entirely the college deduction that helps families afford college in this era of high tuition rates; they get rid of that. They eliminate the Affordable Care Act tax credits, meaning millions of Americans will no longer be able to access affordable care.

Students, they actually start charging students higher interest rates on their loans. Right now, a student in college doesn't have to pay interest on their loan while they are in college. Our Republican colleagues apparently think that \$1 trillion of student debt is not enough. They want to charge them more. It is a fact under this budget.

Seniors, they want to reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole. It is not a secret. They have said they will do this. As a result, seniors with high prescription drug costs on Medicare will be paying lots more, and they will be paying higher copays for preventative health care under this Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, working families, students, and seniors are all squeezed even tighter.

I will tell you who is not squeezed at all under this budget, the folks at the very top. This budget green-lights the Romney-Ryan tax plan. What does that plan propose? Let's cut the top tax rate for millionaires by one-third—by one-third. Let's take it down from 39 percent to the 28, 25 percent range. That is who gets a big break in their tax rates.

While they are cutting tax rates for folks at the very top, what else are they cutting? They are cutting our investment in our kids' education. They are cutting our investment in science and research at places like NIH. They are cutting our investment in modernizing our infrastructure which has helped power our economy.

Why? It is because they are cutting the portion of the budget we use to make those investments by 40 percent below the lowest level as a share of the economy since we have been keeping records in the 1950s. That is a disinvestment in America, so they are cutting those investments.

I will tell you what they don't cut, Mr. Speaker. They don't cut one special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit, not one penny. Apparently, that corporate jet tax deduction? Oh, they really need it. Apparently, that special tax rate for hedge fund managers? They really need it because they don't want to eliminate any of those in order to reduce the deficit. They do apparently want to increase taxes on working families and cut our investment in education.

Here is the sad part about it, Mr. Speaker. After all that, it still doesn't balance, not by a long shot. Here is the chart. I'm sorry we have to go through this math so many times, but I will tell you that the current chairman of the

Senate Budget Committee, Senator ENZI, before he became chairman, talked about this budget accounting scam that is at the heart of the Republican budget and at the heart of the claim that they have a balanced budget because, you see, they claim that, at the end of the 10-year window, they are \$33 billion in balance, but they also say they are eliminating the Affordable Care Act.

Guess what, the budget relies on the same level of revenue as the Affordable Care Act. If you get rid of the Affordable Care Act in those revenues, you are not close to balance.

I will tell you what else it doesn't take into account, the tax provisions. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that we had on this floor, just about 10 days ago, a Republican proposal to eliminate the estate tax for estates over \$10 million.

That was the overwhelming economic priority of our Republican colleagues, to get rid of the estate tax for estates over \$10 million, about 5,500 people in this country per year. You can put more people on a big cruise ship. That added about \$260 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

Guess what, it wasn't accounted for in the Republican budget. If you did account for that in the other tax cut measures for special interests that are being brought to the floor, it is even further out of balance, so this is just Alice in Wonderland accounting.

Mr. Speaker, we really should be going back to the drawing board. We haven't even talked about the whole sort of shell game being played with the OCO account, which is already having an impact on appropriations bills here in the House because our Republican colleagues are doing this year the exact opposite of what they said we should do just last year. Read the Republican's own budget conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with respect to veterans because the reality is that the first bill coming to the floor based on this budget conference report for veterans and military construction, the Veterans of Foreign Wars says it is bad for veterans.

It has a lower amount for our veterans than in the President's proposal. We believe we should be true to the values and priorities of this country, and we don't think that means giving folks at the very top, millionaires, another cut in their tax rate while disinvesting in the rest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I must strongly oppose this Republican conference committee report because it really does take America down the wrong path, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the distinguished vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

□ 1630

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman PRICE for his

extraordinary leadership throughout this entire process. And I want to thank my fellow conferees for their hard work, many hours over many days, to get us to where we are today and, of course, my fellow Budget Committee members, both Republican and Democrat, for the robust discussion, debate, spirit, as it was sometimes. The process worked. We did go late into the night a few times. But we came out of those late nights, those long hours, with the product here today.

The product here today, unfortunately, is a more rare product than it should be. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since 2001, 14 years, we have a balanced joint budget resolution, bicameral.

As a relatively new person to this Chamber, in my fifth year, and you think about why that is the case, you, unfortunately, in my opinion, have to conclude it is because most of the time we are talking about the demagoguery, like some of which we just heard, half the story, so to speak, about what is really going on here. If we had full discussions about where this country really needs to go, where this Federal Government needs to go in terms of improving its debt and deficit picture, the whole budget picture, you would really see that the economy in this country could be better off with those honest, full discussions.

This budget, for example, does balance in less than 10 years without raising taxes—without raising taxes. The gentleman very much knows that the Budget Committee doesn't write tax prescriptions; it is the Ways and Means Committee. We say in our budget document that the Ways and Means Committee should get on with the business of tax reform.

What the Congressional Budget Office that the gentleman mentioned says is that over the 10-year window of this budget agreement, the economy will grow \$400 billion. That is hardly a contraction. \$400 billion, at least to some of us, is a lot of money, and that is great for economic growth. This budget agreement does that.

Do you see what I mean, Mr. Speaker, by "the whole story"?

It also ensures a strong national defense, making sure that our troops have the money they need, but remain accountable to the money that is given. It gives us a chance to repeal in full, taxes and all, ObamaCare, and allows us a chance to start over with patient-centered health reform. It hasn't been done. We haven't had that chance in a long time. ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, is an expensive proposition, and we are seeing more and more proof of that every day.

It strengthens Medicare in the future without affecting those in or near retirement now. This is important. Some of us, for my friends on the conservative side, have looked at the press reports and found, hey, we have given up on Medicare. Absolutely not; nor for Social Security.

These are the drivers of our debt, Mr. Speaker, and our budget language remains intact. The fact of the matter is this conference committee report is numerically driven, not policy driven.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROKITA. And for everyone, this is what is driving our debt. These pieces of the pie. They are all attached together, whether it is Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid, or the interest we owe ourselves and others for the amount of money we are borrowing.

Our ideas for correcting this debt, the drivers of our debt, are still in place. I call upon the authorizing committees, whether it be Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, or any other committee, to start working on reforming this debt.

This budget agreement, Mr. Speaker, gives us the opportunity, finally, after 14 years, to start down that road. This is not a conclusion; this is a beginning, and I ask my Democratic friends to join us down that road.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would actually encourage all those authorizing committees to get to work trying to implement this budget so the American people can see just how bad it is. I would be curious as to whether they are actually going to do it in the next couple of months.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

I rise in strong opposition to this budget.

There is football and then there is fantasy football. Mr. Ranking Member, you were being very charitable when you used the word "scam." This is a real lemon by any stretch—and you don't have to use your imagination.

This is a formula for another 2007–2008. This will be a duplication. And the pain caused by that decade, that 8 years of the 21st century, the budgets from 2001–2008 when we cut taxes in 2001 and we cut taxes in 2003, and then 2007 and 2008 the world fell apart. Why? An enormous loss of jobs every month. Look at the numbers. You want to hold up charts, hold them up.

This agreement uses gimmicks to balance the budget and does so on the backs of the poor and the middle class and senior citizens. It imposes its cuts on programs that assist low- and middle-income Americans even though they constitute—those programs—less than one-fourth of the Federal spending.

The Republican plan would cause tens of millions of people to become uninsured or underinsured. I know how you are careful to even talk about that. In other words, if we are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, make

sure you put in a sentence about what we need to do about those people who have preconditions.

Phony, phony, phony. You said it; we didn't.

Slashing funding for education, for research, for infrastructure. Wait until the bridges fall down and more people fall into the water. Cuts to nutrition, cuts to health will only increase poverty. Your claims that this budget balances is a total farce—not a semi-farce, a total farce.

Congressman VAN HOLLEN produced a very strong, fair budget. It was a strong budget. It was dismissed. But I like it. I like it. Through the Chair to my ranking member, I like it when we are seen as irrelevant. We do our best work.

So that is what you have got in front of you. This budget, while calling for a complete and total repeal of the Affordable Care Act, continues to assume the law's \$2 trillion revenue. That is not a farce. That is fantasy football. How could you do that? The bill stinks, but we will use the money in the bill. Explain that one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCARELL. To me, when we get the taxes, this budget assumes that revenues remained unchanged from our current law. Someone needs to have a conversation with the chairman of Ways and Means, because he seems to be unaware. In fact, he stated explicitly that he doesn't think we should be using the current law baseline. He said it; I didn't.

Two weeks ago, this same majority—and I end on this point, Mr. Speaker—we passed \$294.8 billion in unpaid-for tax breaks for Paris Hilton and Ivanka Trump and the rest of that crowd and their fortune enough to be left a nice inheritance. Much of that money has never been taxed in the first place.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I said when we talked about this the first time around, folks across this land, if they turn on the television and they take a look, you have got one parent yelling at the other: Hide the dog and the cat and the kids, sweetheart, they are talking about the budget.

The distortion and the misrepresentation that is coming from the other side, Mr. Speaker, it really is absolutely phenomenal.

I am pleased to hear that the gentleman likes their budget, and I commend him for liking their budget; but let me just state for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, that neither their budget nor the President's budget ever, ever, ever gets to balance. If the American people can't live on borrowed money, their

Federal Government ought not do so either.

Our budget gets to balance within a 10-year period of time. It does so without raising taxes. That is why the American people are going to appreciate the work that is being done right here.

I am very, very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), an incredibly productive member of our committee, and a member of the conference committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a year makes. Since I came to Congress in 2011, my House Republican colleagues and I worked every year to pass a responsible, timely budget that confronts our runaway spending in Washington; but meanwhile, the Senate Democrats refused to pass a budget during 4 of the last 5 years. That ends now.

This year, our new American Congress worked to pass a balanced budget in both the House and the Senate and to then unify our budgets through regular order. I had the distinct privilege of serving on the budget conference committee, and I am pleased with the final product that we were able to deliver. This will mark the first balanced budget, joint budget resolution, since 2002, and we did it without raising taxes.

But we didn't stop there. This budget would also erase the President's disastrous healthcare law, allowing us to start over on reforms that put patients and their doctors in charge, not Washington bureaucrats. And we used the critical reconciliation tool to help ensure an ObamaCare repeal bill that reaches the President's desk so that we can put him on record, forcing him to make a decision and defend that to the American people.

What is more, this plan supports the growth of 1.2 million jobs over the next decade, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said many times before, budgets aren't just a series of numbers; they are a statement of our values. I believe the priorities found in this budget are shared by my constituents and reflect the values that we can all be proud of.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We keep hearing this mathematical fantasy that somehow the Republican budget balances.

I just want to turn to an authority. He is the now-chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. Here is what he said last year:

One of the problems I have had with budgets that I have looked at is that they use a lot of gimmicks. Now, when there was an anticipation that ObamaCare would go away, and that all of that money would still be there, that's not realistic. I'd like to see us get to a real accounting with the budget.

Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker; the Affordable Care Act is still here, the

revenue is still here, and the Republican budget assumes that revenue for the purpose of achieving balance at the same time they are getting rid of the Affordable Care Act. That leaves people's heads spinning and it means the budget is not in balance.

I am now happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. VAN HOLLEN yielding.

We are talking a lot about gimmicks. Even the conservative Financial Times said the Republicans had to resort to smoke and mirrors to make this budget balance. But I want to talk about one of the other tricks that is used.

What the Republicans' budget uses is they do something called dynamic scoring, which basically allows you to project all sorts of, probably, at least, speculative growth based on policies that they would anticipate doing.

Now, here is a real-world example of that. This weekend is the Kentucky Derby. It would be as if somebody went out and said: I am going to buy a 2-year-old for \$2 million. And then that 2-year-old I am sure is going to win the Kentucky Derby, so I am going to use that \$3 million purse that that horse is certainly going to win next year, and I am going to plug that into my budget so my budget comes out ahead.

Yes, it could happen, but there is no evidence to believe it will happen. That is one of the ways that this budget reaches so-called balance.

There are other macroeconomic effects which we ought to consider, however. As we have mentioned several times, this budget would direct the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

The Deloitte professional services firm just did an audit of Kentucky's experience over the last 14 months, 15 months, with the Affordable Care Act. Here is what it said would happen in Kentucky over the next 6 years.

□ 1645

\$30 billion in increased economic activity, 44,000 new jobs, and a positive impact on the Kentucky State budget of \$850 million—that is what would be eliminated from Kentucky. That is another effect of the Republican budget. Think about what it might do in other States—California, New York, Florida. For it to have that much impact in a State like Kentucky, the national effect would be very consequential.

Aside from all of the truly damaging ways in which this budget affects our economy and our citizens, we have to take note of the fact that there are impacts beyond just the Federal budget, and this budget would be a disaster for the American economy and the American people. I urge its defeat.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a productive and delightful member of our Budget Committee and a freshman member of our conference.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. I thank the chairman for his kind words and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited to say that, for the first time in many years, the House and Senate will adopt a unified resolution for a balanced budget. The 2016 Federal budget resolution will set the guardrails for Federal spending, and it is a step in the right direction for our country.

Families in my home State of Michigan and across the country tighten their belts when there is a change in household income or expenses, and Washington needs to do the same. The 2016 budget resolution does not raise taxes on hard-working Americans. It keeps the promises that have been made to seniors while slowing the soaring national debt. Leaving less debt to our children is vital, and if we fail to act, debt payments will crowd out spending for the priorities of the American people, including national security and protecting the Great Lakes.

This budget provides for flexibility, and it gives States the opportunity to innovate on Medicaid policy, allowing them to design a safety net that works best for those in need. This will move Medicaid further away from Washington bureaucrats and closer to the people it was meant to serve.

This budget also calls for tax reform, which has the potential to add 1 million new private sector jobs. The Tax Code is over 74,000 pages long and was last overhauled 29 years ago. It is time for a pro-growth Tax Code that is simpler and fairer.

This budget addresses our country's fiscal problems in a responsible way, and it puts our Nation on a brighter path for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and colleague and the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Written by House and Senate Republicans alone, it reaffirms their commitment to a severe and unworkable policy agenda that would harm the economy and that stands little chance of being implemented.

This budget conference report draws heavily on the House Republicans' budget framework by eliminating the Medicare guarantee, turning Medicaid into a capped block grant, limiting Pell grants for college students, and cutting nutrition assistance while hiding \$1 trillion in additional cuts behind a magic asterisk to be filled in at some time in the future.

These proposals, if implemented, would be disastrous for our country, and I suspect even most Republicans wouldn't vote to make them law, and I predict they will not vote to make them law. Still, many of its proposals must be taken very seriously.

The Republican budget conference report includes reconciliation instructions to fast-track yet another vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, jeopardizing affordable coverage for millions of Americans with no alternative in sight.

It continues the Republican policy of sequester for nondefense priorities this year—a disinvestment suggestion, an undermining of America's economy and its quality of life—and further limits our ability to invest in priorities like education, research, and infrastructure by \$496 billion below sequester levels over the ensuing decade. This is the same sequester policy that the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee called “unrealistic and ill-conceived.” Let me repeat that. He is the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, HAL ROGERS of Kentucky, and he said that the policies being pursued in this budget are “unrealistic and ill-conceived.” He is right.

Shamelessly, they propose to do all of this while exempting defense spending from the sequester caps. Defense spending needs to be raised. It ought to be raised honestly and not pretend that some slush fund will pay for, not contingencies, which it is intended to do, but for regular defense investments, which we need to do.

This budget conference report is, essentially, a work of fiction, promulgated as a message to the Republican base. I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. Instead, let us work together in a bipartisan way to replace the unrealistic and ill-conceived—not my words but HAL ROGERS' words—and, I would add, completely unworkable sequester caps with an alternative that enables Congress to invest in America's future growth and prosperity.

That is what our constituents want. That is what we owe them—honesty and responsibility. I hope this resolution is defeated.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my friend that we look forward to enacting and bringing forward the policies that are incorporated within this budget. In fact, just last night, the Armed Services Committee passed out on a 60-2 vote policies that are consistent with the spending on the defense area in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), who is a wonderfully productive and energetic member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in watching this debate back and forth, I am reminded of the saying: “If you like sausage, don't watch it being made.” The same is true, certainly, with the budget process, in fairness to my colleague from Maryland, and the same is true for the

overall legislative process. It is a decidedly human and imperfect process.

What we have here is a result of the House and Senate coming together on a budget, and it is something that we haven't seen for a long, long while. We certainly didn't see it while HARRY REID was running the Senate. As a consequence of the House and Senate coming together on a budget, we will see debate go to 11:30 or midnight tonight on appropriations bills, and they will do that week, after week, after week going forward. I, myself, will come down with an amendment on Energy and Water. I suspect other Members in this very Chamber will come down with similar amendments, saying, “I think we need to add something here,” or “we need to subtract something here.”

That process of scrubbing the budget is something that has been absent for years. That process is called regular order, but regular folks back home would call it, simply, common sense because it is what they do every day. Vital to any well-run organization is that ability to go in and say, “This isn't working so well over here. I think we need to take from here this low performer and add to this high performer.” It is done in churches; it is done in families; it is done in businesses; and it needs to be done in the Federal Government.

I think, as a matter of process, what we have is awfully, awfully important. For too long, our Federal Government has been running on automatic pilot. Entitlements run on automatic pilot, but, in essence, domestic discretionary has been running on automatic pilot as we run on CRs and omnibus bills. I mean, you would go bankrupt in no time if your mode of operation were to simply say, “I will take what I spent last year, and I am going to spend it again this year.” Yet that is the way the Federal Government has been running, and it is this budget that actually moves us away from that process.

In fairness to my Democratic colleagues, this is important from the standpoint of democracy. When you have an omnibus bill or a CR, somebody is still deciding what goes into that stuff. It is oftentimes leadership and staff as opposed to rank and file Members going down to the floor and saying, “I think we need to subtract here or to add here.” So there are two different levels that, I think, are awfully important.

Are there still deficiencies? Obviously so. I mean, I think that when you look at the budget cap issue and when you look at the issue of off budget those are both pathways to financial oblivion, and they have got to be addressed. The bigger framework that has been set in place is by moving to regular order and by the House and Senate coming together on a budget—thanks to your leadership, Mr. Chairman—which, I think, is vital. As a consequence, I will be supporting this measure.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the Republican budget because of the way that it treats our Nation's veterans.

As I have said during the Budget Committee debates, the Republican proposal does not provide our past and present servicemembers with the resources they need upon their return. Protecting our veterans is not an option—it is our duty. We owe it to our veterans to provide them with quality health care, education, job training, and the long-term treatment they have earned through their service to our Nation.

It is more than just a moral obligation. It is also a wise investment in America's future. The Greatest Generation was not called “the Greatest Generation” in 1946. That term didn't come about until the 1990s. It had as much to do with what our veterans of World War II did after the war, when they came home, as with what they did in it. To ensure success for today's veterans, we need to do much better than the Republican proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MOULTON. As a veteran, I see firsthand that insufficient funding for VA programs creates an environment in which our veterans fall through the cracks. I do not support simply throwing money at the current bureaucracy, but insufficient funding for the VA and its programs will only exacerbate this problem.

We ought to be able to agree that caring for our veterans should be a national priority. The budget before us today fails to prioritize our servicemen and -women, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a very diligent and dedicated senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I first need to commend and thank Chairman PRICE for all of his hard work in putting this budget resolution together. This is a rare occasion on this floor. It has been a long time since we have had a budget agreement, and it is not an easy thing to do. As one of the House budget conferees, I can tell you that a lot of work has to be done and that a lot of difficult choices have to be made.

Mr. Chairman, you have done a spectacular job in getting this here to the floor.

One of the most important things, Mr. Speaker, that the budget resolution has to do is to, frankly, set the stage so that we can move forward on the appropriations process. We need a budget that puts Congress and our committees on a path to move forward, and this budget resolution does it. It balances the budget within 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes.

It is no secret, I believe—and I think many of us believe—that the first responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect the American people, and it is no secret that the world around us—I think greatly due to the failed foreign policy of this administration—is almost in flames. We see a growing instability, and we see a growing pressure to our allies, and we see the thugs and the enemies of freedom who believe they have a green light.

We must provide for a strong national defense through the robust funding of our troops, of their training, of their equipment, of their readiness. This budget does so. It accomplishes these goals while staying under the budget control caps—in other words, adhering to the law of the land.

□ 1700

It funds the military over the President's request, without breaking the law and without raising taxes. Again, something that is easier said than done, but Chairman PRICE has been able to do that.

At a time when we see China's rapidly growing defense capabilities, North Korea's nuclear weapons program, Iran pursuing theirs, and growing threats from terrorist groups, let's not forget what our number one priority has to be.

This budget resolution reflects our commitment to our national security, to the men and women in uniform, to the safety of the American people. It does so, balancing the budget within 10 years. It does so without raising taxes.

I know it is very easy to be critical; it is very easy to lecture why this is not perfect. It has been a long time coming. I am grateful for the leadership of Mr. PRICE, of his counterpart in the Senate, Chairman ENZI. I ask the Members of this distinguished body to approve this well-thought-out, hard-negotiated budget that funds our priorities, doesn't raise taxes, and even balances within 10 years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has been focused on trying to make sure we have an economy that works for all Americans.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for yielding. More importantly, I want to thank him for his tireless work as our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget. It is truly a pleasure to serve with him.

A budget is a moral document, a document that really reflects our values as a nation. Unfortunately, this budget just does the opposite. Mr. Speaker,

once again, this Congress is poised to take a huge step in the wrong direction.

The budget agreement before us is truly a work hard, get less budget that uses accounting gimmicks to balance the budget, once again on the backs of the most vulnerable. It calls for cuts to nondefense discretionary programs totaling \$496 billion below the already dismally low sequestered level.

This means further draconian cuts to our education, our infrastructure, veterans, and health programs that have already been eviscerated by slash-and-burn Republican austerity plans.

Today, more than 45 million of our fellow Americans are living in poverty. This agreement will push more people over the brink. With \$300 billion in cuts to SNAP—that is our food assistance—\$431 billion in cuts to Medicare, and a half trillion in cuts to Medicaid, struggling families will continue to fall further and further behind.

We can't forget how these cuts disproportionately affect our communities of color, who are more likely to be living in poverty. What is more, this is the latest in the misguided Republican fixation on repealing the Affordable Care Act, which the House has already voted to repeal over 50 times.

The number of uninsured Americans has gone down by 16 million since it was enacted. Why in the world do you want to take health care away from 16 million people? That is mean.

This agreement continues to use the overseas contingency operation, OCO, account as a slush fund for overbudget Pentagon spending by including—I think it is—\$38 billion over the President's request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. I introduced an amendment in committee to eliminate the OCO account increase of \$36 billion that was included in the House Republican budget. Members on both sides of the aisle have criticized OCO as an affront to transparency and Congress' constitutionally mandated oversight responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, last month, we introduced our Democratic, Congressional Progressive Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus alternative budgets. Those budgets reflect real solutions to lift Americans out of poverty and to support the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided and very cynical agreement that would put us on a path to a greater unequal America that provides less liberty and less justice for all. It doesn't reflect who we are as a nation.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a senior, thoughtful member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, with this vote, our Nation is about to take its first step away

from financial ruin and back to prosperity and solvency. Our Nation's debt has literally doubled in 8 years, now exceeding the size of our entire economy. That debt requires us to make interest payments of \$230 billion this year. That is nearly \$2,000 from an average family's taxes just to rent the money that we have already spent.

On our current path, that burden will triple within a decade, eclipsing our entire defense budget. Medicare and Social Security will collapse just a few years after that. Time is not our ally, and the future is not a pleasant place if we continue just a few more years down the road that we have been on.

That is why this budget is so important. It changes the fiscal course of our Nation, slowly pointing us back toward solvency and prosperity. It restores congressional oversight of an abusive Federal bureaucracy.

It rescues our healthcare system from the nightmare of ObamaCare. It rescues Medicare from collapse. It adopts the time-tested progrowth policies that produced the Reagan economic recovery and the unprecedented prosperity of the 1980s.

If we can implement this budget, in 10 years, deficits will turn to surpluses, and we can begin paying down this ruinous debt at a pace that ensures that students now in college will retire into a prosperous, secure, and debt-free America.

It is not perfect, and it is not complete. Ahead of us are many months of legislating to build the governmental streamlining and reforms that it calls for, but if we can set this course and if we can stay this course, one day in the very near future, a new generation of Americans can know just how wonderful it is to awaken and realize that it is morning again in America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), another one of our terrific new members of the Committee on the Budget.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us today is deeply flawed. It forces hard-working families to work more and take home less and puts our country on the wrong path.

It concerns me that the budget put forth by my Republican colleagues does not address the deep, arbitrary, and damaging budget caps we are facing right now. These caps, which are so bad that they were never meant to become law, are now a reality, a reality that we are gutting our military and harming working men and women and their families in multiple ways.

The gimmicks in the conference report do nothing to address the long-term structural problems that budget cuts have created at the Pentagon, and they do nothing on the nondefense side to help hard-working families buy a home, send their children to college, or enjoy a safe, secure retirement with adequate health care.

Democrats have a better way, a better budget, one that creates greater opportunity for a secure future. We need a secure budget, and we shouldn't stand for anything less.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to take a moment and thank the chairman. He has done a tremendous job. Again, he has brought another budget to the floor that balances, but he has done something no one has done in 6 years. He has brought a bicameral budget.

That is something that we shouldn't just take for granted, something that the House and Senate couldn't do for quite sometime. Your leadership has been tremendous.

To my friend on the other side, you make a lot of debates, and I look forward to hearing them. I am thankful this time you have more Democrats on the floor helping you than you did a couple weeks ago, and that is helpful. That is helpful for a debate. This is the place we should have it.

Two weeks ago, I was on this floor to talk about a budget. I said that a budget is a vision for the future; it sets out your priorities, but it also shows your values. Well, for the first time in 6 years, the House and Senate have gotten together, worked out our differences, and drafted a bicameral budget. This budget shows America exactly where we stand.

With this budget, we have a choice before us. Do we keep going down our current path? Or do we change course? Our current path adds to the debt; it is stuck in the past. In fact, the budget the Democrats offered would never balance.

I say to my friend, the ranking member: we have a family close in age; we have children about the same age. My question to the other side is simply this: How will our kids invest in the future when they are busy paying for our past?

The budget is a different course. It says that we will balance the budget and then actually start paying down the debt. It says that it is a more dangerous world, so we will increase spending for defense. It says we will repeal ObamaCare, and it says no new taxes. It says that it is time to grow America's economy, not Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the future is not about Washington; it is not about government trying and failing to solve our problems while adding more and more debt that our children and grandchildren have to pay. America's future, our 21st century, will be built by American people. That is what this budget would do. It is the foundation for a strong American future and a future even brighter than our past.

I look forward to taking the first steps to that future. I look forward to not leaving our children our debt, but

leaving them a brighter future where they have greater opportunities.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the Republican leader, who mentioned the children of America, that if the children of America learn Republican math, we are going to be in real trouble because they won't be able to count.

As the Republican chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget has said, this kind of budget approach that claims balance because they take the level of revenue from the Affordable Care Act, when at the same time say they are repealing the Affordable Care Act, I think most kids can figure out that that is a shell game, and we are going to be in real trouble if that is the basis of teaching math in our schools, not to mention the fact that we have got a budget here that is squeezing people who are really working hard while providing a green light to tax cuts for people at the very top. That is also not a set of priorities I think that we want to pass on to our children.

We want an economy that works for everybody, an economy where everyone who works hard can get ahead. I don't see how we are going to get our kids ahead by providing tax cuts to folks at the top while cutting our kids' education and making them pay more for their college loans. That is a recipe for decline.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding and also for his leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I really want to thank the entire Committee on the Budget and the conferees for doing the hard work and the responsible work of finally focusing on bringing responsibility and fiscal discipline back to Washington.

If you look at what has been happening all across the country, people are struggling. These are tough times. It is a tough economy. People's wages are stagnant. They are paying more for food. They are paying more for electricity. They are surely paying more for health care.

They are looking to Washington and saying: Why doesn't Washington start focusing on these problems? Why doesn't Washington do what families are doing? Hard-working taxpayers live within their means. Why can't Washington do the same?

This budget does that. It focuses on creating a healthy economy, actually getting jobs, and getting people back to work in this country, forcing Washington to finally balance the Federal budget.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, when we pass this budget, it will represent the first time since

2001 that Congress has come together to pass a budget that balances in the 10-year window. That shouldn't be something that happens every 14 years; that should be something we do every year.

The other side surely didn't do it when they were in the majority. In fact, none of the budgets they brought to the floor ever get to balance—not 10 years, not 20 years, not 50 years. They rack up more debt. They increase taxes. There are over \$2 trillion of new taxes in the President's budget that he proposed, and he never gets to balance.

This budget not only calls for good tax reform to make our country competitive again, lower rates so that families can keep more of their money and invest in themselves and not grow the size of government, but it actually focuses on getting more jobs in this country and stop shipping jobs out of the country.

It repeals the President's healthcare law that is causing so many problems, millions of people losing the good healthcare plans they have and paying more for it.

We have got to finally bring this discipline back and finally force Washington to do what families have been doing and be responsible.

It is a good budget. I am glad that we are going to be bringing it to the floor and passing it. Let's get to doing the other work we need to do to get our economy back on track, and it starts here.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This budget does not reflect the priorities of the American people. If you ask most Americans what kind of economy they want, they would say they want an economy that is growing rapidly, with more shared prosperity.

You don't get that kind of economy with trickle-down economics with the kind of theory that is embedded in the Republican budget. That theory is that if you provide tax rate cuts to people at the very top—to millionaires—somehow the benefits are going to trickle down and lift everybody up. We tried that in the 2000s under George Bush. It didn't work.

What happened—not surprisingly—is folks at the top who got tax cuts ended up with even more take-home income. Everybody else was either treading water or falling behind. Why we would want a budget based on a failed economic strategy is going to leave the American public scratching their heads.

The approach we recommended was one where we provide more tax relief to hard-working Americans. We wanted to expand the provision for child and dependent tax credits so that people can make sure their kids are in a safe environment while they are at work and not have to break the family bank in order to do it.

We want to invest in our kids' education; we want to invest in scientific research, and we want to pay for it by closing some of those tax breaks that encourage American corporations to ship American jobs and money overseas and getting rid of the special tax rates that hedge fund managers have that hard-working Americans don't.

We proposed fixing a tax system that is rigged in favor of the special interests and the very powerful and changing in a way that provides additional help to people who are being squeezed and are in the middle or working their way into the middle. That is an economic plan that works for everybody in the country, not one that just works for people at the very top.

What we saw just last week was the number one economic priority of our Republican colleagues was to eliminate the estate tax on estates above \$10 million, help 5,500 Americans run up the deficit by \$270 billion, and then come back and say, Hey, the deficit just went up by \$270 billion because we provided an estate tax cut to estates \$10 million and up. Now, let's cut our kids' education. Let's increase the amount we charge seniors for their prescription drugs. Let's raise the cost of student loans. Let's cut our investment in kids' education.

That is what this Republican budget does. It is not that our colleagues don't believe in this failed theory, but you would think, at some point, reality would intrude, and people would say we need an economy that works for every American, not just a few.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget. Let's start again in a way that really reflects the greatness of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. Con. Res. 11.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it is appropriate that we begin the process of this debate that is called "and now for the rest of the story."

For folks who are watching and for our colleagues who have been observing this debate and want more information, I would urge you to go to the Web site and take a peek at the resolution,

budget.house.gov. You can get all sorts of information about the positive solutions that we are putting forward.

It is not just our opinion. We have got a lot of folks who are out there supporting the resolution that we put forward.

The 60 Plus Association says:

On behalf of more than 7 million senior citizen activists, the 60 Plus Association applauds the leadership of you and Senate Budget Committee Chairman ENZI in putting forth a responsible balanced budget plan. Not only will this legislation protect today's seniors, but it will also protect our children and grandchildren.

The National Federation of Independent Business says:

On behalf of the NFIB, the Nation's leading small business advocacy organization, thank you for your efforts . . . NFIB and small-business owners strongly support your efforts.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce: the world's largest business federation representing interests of more than 3 million businesses—those are jobs, Mr. Speaker—of all sizes, sectors, and regions strongly supports your resolution.

The Association of Mature American Citizens:

On behalf of 1.3 million members of AMAC . . . I am writing to applaud the House and Senate for working to pass a budget this year and to convey our strong support for the policies set forth therein.

There is significant support literally from across the country, Mr. Speaker.

I want to address some very specific issues that have come forward because, as I say, now, it is time for the rest of the story.

Our friends talk about the lack of growth within our budget. In fact, that is not the case. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office stipulates that over \$400 million in growth will occur in the first 10-year period of time. We believe it will be much more than that because we believe in a dynamic market.

We believe that, when you allow the economy to thrive, when you allow folks to have more jobs and more opportunity and more dreams realized, that in fact you get the economy rolling to a greater degree and actually more increase in growth will occur within the economy.

We have heard from our friends on the other side about all these tax increases that are in this budget. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you very clearly: there are no tax increases in this budget. We balance the budget within a 10-year period of time with no tax increases. What they describe is their extrapolation on what they think policy is going to be.

As you know and our colleagues in this Chamber know, it is not the Budget Committee that brings forward tax resolutions. It is the Ways and Means Committee. We charge the Ways and Means Committee with coming forward with progrowth tax policy to get this economy rolling again and to actually get rates down—yes, for large and

small businesses, so that we can create more jobs, but, yes, Mr. Speaker, for the American people as well.

That is our vision. That is our goal. That is what we think ought to occur again so that more dreams can be realized and more Americans can have the kind of opportunity that they so desire.

We have heard a lot of talk about student loans. Mr. Speaker, this budget resolution does not decrease student loans, does not decrease the Pell grants. It is important that the American people know that. If you don't believe it, just go to the Web site. Read the resolution at budget.house.gov.

We have heard over and over and over again about the talk on health care. In fact, one individual on the other side of the aisle said we were "taking away health care from 16 million."

Nonsense, Mr. Speaker, nonsense—it just simply is not so. What we believe is that we ought to have a healthcare system that actually works for patients and families and doctors and allows them to make medical decisions and healthcare decisions, not Washington, D.C., not the Federal Government. That is not what the American people want.

We are mired in a system right now that the President forced down the throats of the American people and our friends on the other side of the aisle forced down the throats of those of us in this Congress a few short years ago. We are mired in a system that actually is providing less quality of care and less affordability and less access to care.

That is not what we believe ought to happen. What we do is charge the committees with coming forward with that patient-centered solution, a solution that will again put patients and families and doctors in charge.

Then we hear about continuing the sequester. You are right. We do follow the law of the land, Mr. Speaker, because the budget resolution can't change the sequester.

I challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and I invite them to work together as we move forward over the next number of months to get together and solve the challenge of sequester in a responsible way by decreasing spending on the mandatory side so that we can find the resources that are so vitally necessary on the discretionary side. I welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that gets our Nation's fiscal house in order. It is a budget that would get folks back to work. It is a budget that would save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid, put us on a path to saving Social Security. It is a budget that protects our national defense. It is a budget that deserves support in this Chamber.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the staff of the House Budget Committee and the Office of the Sixth District of Georgia. We are on the cusp of agreeing to

this budget resolution, due in large part, to the hard work and dedication of my staff. For the past four months, they have worked many long hours and out of the spotlight to help build a budget that balances within 10 years. It has been an honor to work with each of these staff members as they have helped craft a budget this Congress can be proud of, and the staff should be proud of what they have helped accomplish.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE STAFF

Alex Campau, Alex Stoddard, Amanda Street, Andy Morton, Ben Garndenhour, Brad Watson, Dick Magee, Eric Davis, Emily Goff, Ersin Aydin, Jane Lee, Jenna Speelman, Jim Bates, Jim Herz, Jon Romito, Jose Guillen, Justin Bogie, Kara McKee, Kelle Long, Kyle Cormney, Mary Popadiuk, Pat Knudsen, Paul Restuccia, Rich Kisielowski, Rick May, Ryan Murphy, Tim Flynn, William Allison.

PERSONAL AND DISTRICT OFFICE STAFF

Brent Robertson, Carla DiBlasio, Charlene Puchalla, Cheyenne Foster, Daniel Grey, Devin Krecl, Gary Beck, Jennifer Poole, Kris Skrzycki, Kyle McGowan, Kyle Zebley, Megan Wells, Meghan Dugan, Meghan Graf, Ryan Brooks, Tina McIntosh, Warren Negri.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1740

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 11, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 197, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—226

Abraham	Griffith	Pitts
Aderholt	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Allen	Guinta	Poliquin
Amodei	Guthrie	Pompeo
Babin	Hanna	Posey
Barletta	Hardy	Price, Tom
Barr	Harper	Ratcliffe
Barton	Harris	Reed
Benishek	Hartzler	Reichert
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Black	Hill	Rigell
Blackburn	Holding	Roby
Blum	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Boehner	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brat	Hunter	Rokita
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Roskam
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Calvert	Jordan	Russell
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Knight	Sessions
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Shuster
Comstock	Lance	Simpson
Conaway	Latta	Smith (MO)
Cook	Long	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Love	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Stefanik
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Lummis	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	MacArthur	Stutzman
Denham	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Dent	Marino	Thornberry
DeSantis	McCarthy	Tiberi
DesJarlais	McCaul	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	McClintock	Trott
Dold	McHenry	Turner
Duffy	McKinley	Upton
Duncan (SC)	McMorris	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	Rodgers	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	Meadows	Walden
Farenthold	Meehan	Walker
Fincher	Messer	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Fleischmann	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Flores	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Forbes	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Fortenberry	Mullin	Whitfield
Fox	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Newhouse	Wittman
Gibbs	Noem	Womack
Gohmert	Nugent	Woodall
Goodlatte	Nunes	Yoder
Gosar	Olson	Yoho
Gowdy	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Granger	Palmer	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Pearce	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Perry	
	Pittenger	

NAYS—197

Adams	Bonamici	Carney
Aguiar	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Amash	F.	Cartwright
Ashford	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Becerra	Bustos	Cicilline
Bera	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clay
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cleaver

Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter
Connolly	Jolly	Peters
Conyers	Jones	Peterson
Cooper	Kaptur	Pingree
Costa	Katko	Pocan
Courtney	Keating	Polis
Crawford	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kennedy	Quigley
Cuellar	Kildee	Rangel
Cummings	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Kuster	Ruiz
DeGette	Labrador	Ruppersberger
Delaney	Langevin	Rush
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	T.
Deutch	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Levin	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schiff
F.	LoBiondo	Schrader
Duckworth	Loebach	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Ellison	Lowe	Serrano
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	(NM)	Sherman
Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sinema
Farr	(NM)	Sires
Fattah	Lynch	Slaughter
Foster	Maloney,	Speier
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Takai
Gabbard	Massie	Takano
Gallego	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Garamendi	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Gibson	McDermott	Titus
Graham	McGovern	Tonko
Grayson	McNerney	Torres
Green, Al	McSally	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Meeks	Van Hollen
Grijalva	Meng	Vargas
Gutiérrez	Moore	Veasey
Hahn	Moulton	Vela
Hastings	Mulvaney	Velázquez
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Higgins	Nadler	Walz
Himes	Napolitano	Walters, Maxine
Honda	Neal	Watson Coleman
Hoyer	Nolan	Welch
Huffman	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Israel	O'Rourke	Yarmuth
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Zinke
Jeffries	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—9

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Garrett	Payne	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)	
Hinojosa	Wagner	

□ 1815

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ROGERS of Alabama, COLE, STEWART, FINCHER, and REICHERT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 183 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2029.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) kindly take the chair.

□ 1817

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. DOLD (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 29, 2015, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 67, line 10.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland.

An amendment by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

An amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

An amendment by Mr. POCAN of Wisconsin.

An amendment by Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 229, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

AYES—191

Adams	Becerra	Bonamici
Amash	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Bass	Bishop (GA)	F.
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)	Grijalva
Burgess	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	Hahn
Capps	Hastings
Capuano	Heck (WA)
Cárdenas	Higgins
Carney	Himes
Carson (IN)	Honda
Cartwright	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Huelskamp
Castro (TX)	Huffman
Chu, Judy	Israel
Ciilline	Jackson Lee
Clark (MA)	Jeffries
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.
Cleaver	Jones
Clyburn	Jordan
Cohen	Kaptur
Collins (GA)	Keating
Connolly	Kelly (IL)
Cooper	Kennedy
Conyers	Kildee
Costa	Kilmer
Crowley	Kind
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick
Cummings	Kuster
Davis (CA)	Labrador
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)
DeGette	Lawrence
Delaney	Lee
DeLauro	Levin
DelBene	Lieu, Ted
DeSaulnier	Loebback
DesJarlais	Lofgren
Deutch	Lowenthal
Dingell	Lowe
Doggett	Lujan Grisham
Doyle, Michael F.	(NM)
Duncan (TN)	Luján, Ben Ray
Edwards	(NM)
Ellison	Lummis
Engel	Lynch
Eshoo	Maloney,
Esty	Carolyn
Farr	Massie
Fattah	Matsui
Foster	McClintock
Frankel (FL)	McCollum
Fudge	McDermott
Gabbard	McGovern
Gallego	McNerney
Garamendi	Meeks
Garrett	Meng
Gohmert	Moore
Gosar	Mulvaney
Grayson	Nadler
Green, Al	Napolitano
Green, Gene	Neal
Griffith	Nolan
	O'Rourke

NOES—229

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Aderholt	Coffman	Gibbs
Aguilar	Cole	Gibson
Allen	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Amodei	Comstock	Gowdy
Ashford	Conaway	Graham
Babin	Cook	Granger
Barletta	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Barr	Courtney	Graves (LA)
Barton	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Benishek	Crawford	Grothman
Bera	Crenshaw	Guinta
Bilirakis	Culberson	Guthrie
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Hanna
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Hardy
Black	Denham	Harper
Blackburn	Dent	Harris
Blum	DeSantis	Hartzler
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Boustany	Dold	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Duckworth	Hice, Jody B.
Brat	Duffy	Hill
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Farenthold	Hultgren
Buchanan	Fincher	Hunter
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)
Bustos	Fleischmann	Hurt (VA)
Byrne	Fleming	Jenkins (KS)
Calvert	Flores	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (GA)	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Fox	Jolly
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Joyce

Katko	Newhouse	Sessions
Kelly (PA)	Noem	Shimkus
King (IA)	Norcross	Shuster
King (NY)	Nugent	Simpson
Kinzinger (IL)	Nunes	Sinema
Kline	Olson	Smith (MO)
Knight	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
LaMalfa	Palmer	Smith (NJ)
Lamborn	Paulsen	Stefanik
Lance	Pearce	Stewart
Langevin	Peters	Stivers
Latta	Pittenger	Stutzman
Lipinski	Pitts	Takai
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Long	Poliquin	Thornberry
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Tiberi
Love	Price, Tom	Trott
Lucas	Ratcliffe	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Upton
MacArthur	Reichert	Valadao
Maloney, Sean	Renacci	Walberg
Marchant	Ribble	Walden
Marino	Rice (SC)	Walker
McCarthy	Rigell	Walorski
McCaul	Roby	Walters, Mimi
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Wenstrup
Rodgers	Rokita	Westerman
McSally	Rooney (FL)	Westmoreland
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Messer	Roskam	Williams
Mica	Ross	Wilson (SC)
Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Wittman
Miller (MI)	Rouzer	Womack
Moolenaar	Royce	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Ruiz	Young (AK)
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Young (IA)
Mullin	Russell	Young (IN)
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Zeldin
Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Zinke
Neugebauer	Scott, Austin	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Meadows	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Payne	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Smith (TX)	Schultz
Lewis	Smith (WA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1822

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 229, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

AYES—192

Adams	Becerra	Blumenauer
Amash	Beyer	Bonamici
Beatty	Bishop (GA)	

Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Gene Griffith	O'Rourke	Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (FL)	Scalise	Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Gene Griffith	Nolan
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Pallone	Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin	Brady (PA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Brooks (AL)	Gutiérrez	Pascarell	Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Sessions	Brooks (AL)	Grothman	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Pelosi	Johnson, Sam	Newhouse	Shimkus	Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Burgess	Hastings	Perlmutter	Jolly	Noem	Shuster	Burgess	Hahn	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Perry	Joyce	Norcross	Simpson	Butterfield	Hastings	Perry
Capps	Higgins	Peterson	Katko	Nugent	Sinema	Capps	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Capuano	Himes	Pingree	Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Smith (MO)	Capuano	Higgins	Pingree
Cárdenas	Honda	Pocan	King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NE)	Cárdenas	Himes	Pocan
Carney	Hoyer	Polis	King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)	Carney	Honda	Polis
Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Price (NC)	Kinzinger (IL)	Palmer	Smith (TX)	Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Huffman	Quigley	Kline	Paulsen	Stefanik	Cartwright	Huelskamp	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Israel	Rangel	Knight	Pearce	Stewart	Castor (FL)	Huffman	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)	Lamborn	Peters	Stivers	Castro (TX)	Israel	Rice (NY)
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Richmond	Lance	Pittenger	Stutzman	Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Rohrabacher	Langevin	Pitts	Takai	Cicilline	Jeffries	Rohrabacher
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard	Latta	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)	Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Jones	Rush	Lipinski	Pompeo	Thornberry	Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Clay	Jordan	Ryan (OH)	LoBiondo	Posey	Tiberi	Clay	Jones	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Salmon	Long	Price, Tom	Trott	Cleaver	Jordan	Salmon
Clyburn	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.	Love	Ratcliffe	Turner	Clyburn	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Lucas	Reed	Upton	Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Sanford	Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Valadao	Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Sanford
Connolly	Kildee	Sarbanes	MacArthur	Renacci	Walberg	Connolly	Kildee	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kilmer	Schakowsky	Maloney, Sean	Ribble	Walden	Conyers	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cooper	Kind	Schiff	Marchant	Rice (SC)	Walorski	Cooper	Kind	Schakowsky
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Schrader	Marino	Rigell	Walters, Mimi	Costa	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Crowley	Kuster	Schweikert	McCarthy	Roby	Weber (TX)	Crowley	Kuster	Schweikert
Cuellar	Labrador	Scott (VA)	McCaul	Roe (TN)	Webster (FL)	Cummings	Labrador	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David	McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Westerman	Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sensenbrenner	McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland	Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Serrano	McMorris	Rokita	Whitfield	DeFazio	Lawrence	Serrano
DeFazio	Lee	Sewell (AL)	Rodgers	Rooney (FL)	Williams	DeGette	Lee	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	Levin	Sherman	McSally	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)	Delaney	Levin	Sherman
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Sires	Meadows	Roskam	Wittman	DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Slaughter	Meehan	Ross	Womack	DeBene	Loeb sack	Slaughter
DeBene	Lofgren	Speier	Messer	Rothfus	Yoder	DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Speier
DeSaulnier	Loudermilk	Swalwell (CA)	Mica	Rouzer	Young (AK)	DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Swalwell (CA)
DesJarlais	Lowenthal	Takano	Miller (MI)	Royce	Young (IA)	Deutch	Lowenthal	Takano
Deutch	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)	Moolenaar	Ruiz	Young (IN)	Dingell	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)	Mooney (WV)	Ruppersberger	Zeldin	Doggett	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Tipton	Moulton	Russell	Zinke	Doyle, Michael F.	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Tipton
Doyle, Michael F.	Lummis	Titus	Mullin	Ryan (WI)		Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Titus
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Tonko				Edwards	Lynch	Tonko
Edwards	Maloney,	Torres				Ellison	Maloney,	Torres
Ellison	Carolyn	Tsongas				Engel	Carolyn	Tsongas
Engel	Massie	Van Hollen				Eshoo	Massie	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Matsui	Vargas				Esty	Matsui	Vargas
Esty	McClintock	Veasey				Farr	McClintock	Veasey
Farr	McColum	Velázquez				Fattah	McColum	Velázquez
Fattah	McDermott	Visclosky				Foster	McDermott	Visclosky
Foster	McGovern	Walker				Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Walker
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Walz				Fudge	McNerney	Walz
Fudge	Meeks	Waters, Maxine				Gabbard	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Gabbard	Meng	Watson Coleman				Gallego	Meng	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Moore	Welch				Garamendi	Moore	Welch
Garamendi	Mulvaney	Wilson (FL)				Garrett	Mulvaney	Wilson (FL)
Garrett	Nadler	Woodall				Gohmert	Nadler	Woodall
Gohmert	Napolitano	Yarmuth				Gosar	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Gosar	Neal	Yoho				Grayson	Neal	Yoho
Grayson	Nolan					Green, Al		

NOES—229

Abraham	Chabot	Forbes
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Fortenberry
Aguilar	Clawson (FL)	Fox
Allen	Coffman	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Ashford	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Babin	Comstock	Gibson
Barletta	Conaway	Goodlatte
Barr	Cook	Gowdy
Barton	Costello (PA)	Graham
Bass	Courtney	Granger
Benishek	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Bera	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Guinta
Black	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Blackburn	Denham	Hanna
Blum	Dent	Hardy
Bost	DeSantis	Harper
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Harris
Brady (TX)	Dold	Hartzler
Brat	Duckworth	Heck (NV)
Bridenstine	Duffy	Hensarling
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brownley (CA)	Ellmers (NC)	Hill
Buchanan	Emmer (MN)	Holding
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hudson
Bustos	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Calvert	Fleischmann	Hunter
Carter (GA)	Fleming	Hurd (TX)
Carter (TX)	Flores	Hurt (VA)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—9

Buck	Miller (FL)	Wasserman
Herrera Beutler	Payne	Schultz
Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	
Lewis	Wagner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1827

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 231, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

AYES—190

Adams	Becerra	Blumenauer
Amash	Beyer	Bonamici
Beatty	Bishop (GA)	

NOES—231

Abraham	Chabot	Flores
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Forbes
Aguilar	Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry
Allen	Coffman	Fox
Amodei	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Ashford	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Babin	Comstock	Gibbs
Barletta	Conaway	Gibson
Barr	Cook	Goodlatte
Barton	Costello (PA)	Gowdy
Bass	Courtney	Graham
Benishek	Cramer	Granger
Bera	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Bishop (MI)	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Guinta
Black	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Blum	Denham	Hardy
Bost	Dent	Harper
Boustany	DeSantis	Harris
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Brat	Dold	Heck (NV)
Bridenstine	Duckworth	Hensarling
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Brownley (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Buchanan	Ellmers (NC)	Holding
Bucshon	Emmer (MN)	Hudson
Bustos	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Byrne	Fincher	Hultgren
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Hurd (TX)
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Hurt (VA)

Lance	Pearce	Shuster
Latta	Perry	Simpson
Lipinski	Peterson	Sinema
LoBiondo	Pittenger	Smith (MO)
Long	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Loudermilk	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Love	Poliquin	Smith (TX)
Lucas	Pompeo	Stefanik
Luetkemeyer	Posey	Stewart
Lummis	Price, Tom	Stivers
MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Stutzman
Maloney, Sean	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Marchant	Reichert	Thornberry
Marino	Renacci	Tiberi
Massie	Ribble	Tipton
McCarthy	Rice (SC)	Trott
McCaul	Rigell	Turner
McClintock	Roby	Upton
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Valadao
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Vela
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walden
McSally	Rokita	Walker
Meadows	Rooney (FL)	Walorski
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Walters, Mimi
Messer	Roskam	Weber (TX)
Mica	Ross	Webster (FL)
Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Wenstrup
Miller (MI)	Rouzer	Westerman
Moolenaar	Royce	Westmoreland
Mooney (WV)	Ruiz	Whitfield
Mullin	Ruppersberger	Williams
Mulvaney	Russell	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
Neugebauer	Salmon	Womack
Newhouse	Sanchez, Loretta	Woodall
Noem	Scalise	Yoder
Nugent	Schweikert	Yoho
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Olson	Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)
Palazzo	Sessions	Young (IN)
Palmer	Sewell (AL)	Zeldin
Paulsen	Shimkus	Zinke

Adams	Bera	Brady (PA)
Aguilar	Beyer	Brown (FL)
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Ashford	Blum	Bustos
Bass	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Beatty	Bonamici	Capps
Becerra	Boyle, Brendan	Capuano
Benishek	F.	Cárdenas

Carney	Higgins	Perlmutter	Keating	Noem	Shimkus	Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Himes	Perry	Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Shuster	Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Pocan
Cartwright	Honda	Peters	Kennedy	Nunes	Simpson	DeFazio	Kildee	Polis
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Pingree	King (IA)	Olson	Smith (MO)	DeGette	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Pocan	King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Delaney	Kind	Quigley
Chaffetz	Hunter	Poliquin	Kline	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Chu, Judy	Israel	Polis	Knight	Paulsen	Smith (TX)	DelBene	Kuster	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)	Labrador	Pearce	Stefanik	DeSaulnier	Langevin	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Quigley	LaMalfa	Peterson	Stewart	Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Rangel	Lamborn	Pittenger	Stutzman	Dingell	Ruiz	Ruiz
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Reed	Lance	Pitts	Thompson (PA)	Doggett	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Jones	Rice (NY)	Latta	Poe (TX)	Thornberry	Doyle, Michael F.	Lee	Rush
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rice (SC)	Levin	Pompeo	Tiberi	Duckworth	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Coffman	Kelly (IL)	Richmond	Lipinski	Posey	Tipton	Edwards	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cohen	Kildee	Rohrabacher	Long	Price, Tom	Trott	Ellison	Lipinski	
Collins (NY)	Kilmer	Rooney (FL)	Loudermilk	Ratcliffe	Turner	Engel	LoBiondo	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Kind	Roybal-Allard	Lucas	Reichert	Valadao	Eshoo	Sarbanes	
Conyers	Kinzingler (IL)	Ruiz	Luetkemeyer	Renacci	Walberg	Loftgren	Schakowsky	Schiff
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger	Lummis	Ribble	Walden	Esty	Lowenthal	Schrader
Costa	Kuster	Rush	MacArthur	Rigell	Walker	Farr	Lowey	Scott (VA)
Costello (PA)	Langevin	Ryan (OH)	Marchant	Roby	Walorski	Fattah	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Scott, David
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Marino	Roe (TN)	Walters, Mimi	Fitzpatrick	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Serrano
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta	McCarthy	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)	Foster	Lynch	Sherman
Cummings	Lawrence	Sanford	McCauley	Rogers (KY)	Webster (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney	Sinema
Curbelo (FL)	Lee	Sarbanes	McHenry	Rokita	Wenstrup	Fudge	Carolyn	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	LoBiondo	Schiff	McMorris	Roskam	Whitfield	Galego	Matsui	Speier
Davis, Rodney	Loeb sack	Schrader	Rodgers	Ross	Williams	Garamendi	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Schweikert	McSally	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)	Graham	McDermott	Takai
DeGette	Love	Scott (VA)	Meadows	Rouzer	Woodall	Grayson	McGovern	Takano
Delaney	Lowenthal	Scott, David	Meehan	Royce	Yoder	Green, Al	McNerney	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowey	Serrano	Messer	Russell	Yoho	Green, Gene	Meeks	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sherman	Mica	Ryan (WI)	Young (IA)	Grijalva	Meng	Titus
DeSaulnier	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Sinema	Miller (FL)	Salmon	Young (IN)	Gutiérrez	Moore	Tonko
Deutch	Lynch	Sires	Miller (MI)	Scalise		Hahn	Moulton	Torres
Dingell	Maloney	Slaughter	Moolenaar	Scott, Austin		Hastings	Murphy (FL)	Tsongas
Doggett	Maloney, Carolyn	Speier	Mullin	Sensenbrenner		Heck (WA)	Nadler	Van Hollen
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Stivers	Murphy (PA)	Sessions		Higgins	Napolitano	Vargas
Duckworth	Massie	Swalwell (CA)	Neugebauer	Sewell (AL)		Himes	Neal	Veasey
Edwards	Matsui	Takai				Hoyer	Nolan	Vela
Ellison	McClintock	Takano	Buck	Lewis	Wagner	Huffman	Israel	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Thompson (CA)	Herrera Beutler	Payne	Wasserman	Jeffries	Norcross	Visclosky
Eshoo	McDermott	Thompson (MS)	Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	Schultz	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke	Walz
Esty	McGovern	Titus				Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Walsh
Farr	McNerney	Tonko				Jones	Pascrell	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	Meeks	Torres				Kaptur	Pelosi	Watson Coleman
Foster	Meng	Tsongas				Keating	Perlmutter	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Mooney (WV)	Upton					Peters	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Moore	Van Hollen					Peterson	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Moulton	Vargas						
Galego	Mulvaney	Veasey						
Gibson	Murphy (FL)	Vela						
Graham	Nadler	Velázquez						
Grayson	Napolitano	Visclosky						
Green, Al	Neal	Walz						
Green, Gene	Newhouse	Waters, Maxine						
Grijalva	Nolan	Watson Coleman						
Gutiérrez	Norcross	Welch						
Hahn	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)						
Hanna	Pallone	Yarmuth						
Hastings	Pascrell	Young (AK)						
Heck (NV)	Pelosi	Zeldin						
Heck (WA)		Zinke						

NOES—213

Abraham	Cook	Gosar
Aderholt	Cramer	Gowdy
Allen	Crawford	Granger
Amodei	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Babin	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Barr	Denham	Griffith
Barton	Dent	Grothman
Bilirakis	DeSantis	Guinta
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Hardy
Black	Dold	Harper
Blackburn	Duffy	Harris
Bost	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Ellmers (NC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brat	Emmer (MN)	Hill
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Fincher	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Bucshon	Fleming	Hultgren
Burgess	Flores	Hurd (TX)
Byrne	Forbes	Hurt (VA)
Calvert	Fortenberry	Issa
Carter (GA)	Fox	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (WV)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Clawson (FL)	Garamendi	Johnson, Sam
Cole	Garrett	Jolly
Collins (GA)	Gibbs	Jordan
Comstock	Gohmert	Joyce
Conaway	Goodlatte	Katko

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1839

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POCAN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

AYES—186

Adams	Brown (FL)	Clark (MA)
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Ashford	Bustos	Clay
Bass	Butterfield	Cleaver
Beatty	Capps	Clyburn
Becerra	Capuano	Cohen
Bera	Cárdenas	Connolly
Beyer	Carney	Conyers
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Blumenauer	Cartwright	Costa
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Boyle, Brendan F.	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
	Cicilline	Cummings

Abraham	Denham	Huelskamp
Aderholt	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Allen	DeSantis	Hultgren
Amash	DesJarlais	Hunter
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Hurd (TX)
Babin	Dold	Hurt (VA)
Barletta	Duffy	Issa
Barr	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)
Barton	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (WV)
Benishek	Ellmers (NC)	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	Emmer (MN)	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (MI)	Farenthold	Jolly
Bishop (UT)	Fincher	Jordan
Black	Fleischmann	Joyce
Blackburn	Fleming	Katko
Blum	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Bost	Forbes	King (IA)
Boustany	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Fox	Kinzingler (IL)
Brat	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Labrador
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Gibson	Lamborn
Bucshon	Gohmert	Lance
Burgess	Goodlatte	Latta
Byrne	Gosar	Long
Calvert	Gowdy	Loudermilk
Carter (GA)	Granger	Love
Carter (TX)	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Chabot	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Clawson (FL)	Griffith	MacArthur
Coffman	Grothman	Marchant
Cole	Guinta	Marino
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	Massie
Collins (NY)	Hanna	McCarthy
Comstock	Hardy	McCauley
Conaway	Harper	McClintock
Cook	Harris	McHenry
Costello (PA)	Hartzler	McKinley
Cramer	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Crawford	Hensarling	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Hice, Jody B.	McSally
Culberson	Hill	Meadows
Curbelo (FL)	Holding	Meehan
Davis, Rodney	Hudson	Messer

Mica	Roby	Thompson (PA)	Gibbs	Massie	Ross	McNerney	Rice (NY)	Stivers
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Thornberry	Gohmert	McCarthy	Rothfus	Meehan	Richmond	Swaiwell (CA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi	Goodlatte	McCauley	Rouzer	Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Takai
Moolenaar	Rogers (KY)	Tipton	Gosar	McClintock	Royce	Meng	Ros-Lehtinen	Takano
Mooney (WV)	Rohrabacher	Trott	Gowdy	McHenry	Russell	Moore	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Mullin	Rokita	Turner	Granger	McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Moulton	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
Mulvaney	Rooney (FL)	Upton	Graves (GA)	Rodgers	Salmon	Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao	Graves (LA)	McSally	Sanford	Murphy (PA)	Rush	Titus
Neugebauer	Roskam	Walberg	Griffith	Meadows	Scalise	Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Newhouse	Ross	Walden	Grothman	Schweikert	Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda T.	Sánchez, Loretta	Torres
Noem	Rothfus	Walker	Guinta	Sensenbrenner	Neal	Nolan	Sarbanes	Tsongas
Nugent	Royce	Walorski	Hardy	Sessions	Nolan	Norcross	Schakowsky	Turner
Nunes	Russell	Walters, Mimi	Harper	Shimkus	O'Rourke	Pallone	Schiff	Valadao
Olson	Ryan (WI)	Weber (TX)	Harris	Simpson	Pascarell	Pelosi	Schrader	Van Hollen
Palazzo	Salmon	Webster (FL)	Hartzler	Smith (MO)	Scott (VA)	Perlmutter	Scott, Austin	Vargas
Palmer	Sanford	Westerman	Hensarling	Smith (NE)	Peters	Peterson	Serrano	Veasey
Paulsen	Scalise	Westmoreland	Hice, Jody B.	Smith (TX)	Pingree	Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Pearce	Schweikert	Whitfield	Hill	Stewart	Polis	Price (NC)	Sherman	Velázquez
Perry	Scott, Austin	Williams	Holding	Stutzman	Quigley	Rangel	Shuster	Visclosky
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)	Hudson	Thompson (PA)	Reed	Reichert	Sinema	Walz
Pitts	Sessions	Wittman	Huelskamp	Tipton	Reichert	Renacci	Sires	Waters, Maxine
Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Womack	Huizenga (MI)	Trott	Renacci		Slaughter	Watson Coleman
Poliquin	Shuster	Woodall	Hultgren	Upton			Smith (NJ)	Welch
Pompeo	Smith (MO)	Yoder	Hunter	Walberg			Speier	Wilson (FL)
Posey	Smith (NE)	Yoho	Hurd (TX)	Walden			Stefanik	Yarmuth
Price, Tom	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)	Hurt (VA)	Walker				Young (AK)
Ratcliffe	Smith (TX)	Young (IA)	Issa	Walorski				Zeldin
Reed	Stefanik	Young (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Walters, Mimi				
Reichert	Stewart	Zinke	Johnson, Sam	Weber (TX)				
Renacci	Stivers		Jones	Webster (FL)				
Ribble	Stutzman		Jordan	Wenstrup				
Rice (SC)			King (IA)	Westerman				
Rigell			Kline	Whitfield				

NOT VOTING—8

Buck	Lewis	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Payne	Wasserman
Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1842

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

AYES—190

Abraham	Buchanan	DeSantis
Aderholt	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Allen	Burgess	Duffy
Amash	Byrne	Duncan (SC)
Amodei	Calvert	Duncan (TN)
Babin	Carter (GA)	Ellmers (NC)
Barr	Carter (TX)	Emmer (MN)
Billirakis	Chabot	Farenthold
Bishop (MI)	Chaffetz	Fincher
Black	Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Coffman	Fleming
Blum	Collins (GA)	Flores
Boustany	Comstock	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Fortenberry
Brat	Cramer	Foxx
Bridenstine	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Garrett

NOES—232

Adams	Davis (CA)	Huffman
Aguilar	Davis, Danny	Israel
Ashford	Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee
Barletta	DeFazio	Jeffries
Bass	DeGette	Jenkins (WV)
Beatty	Delaney	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	DeLauro	Johnson (OH)
Benishek	DelBene	Johnson, E. B.
Bera	Denham	Jolly
Beyer	Dent	Joyce
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Kaptur
Bishop (UT)	Deutch	Katko
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Keating
Bonamici	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Bost	Doggett	Kelly (PA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Dold	Kennedy
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael F.	Kildee
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Kilmer
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Kind
Bustos	Ellison	King (NY)
Butterfield	Engel	Kinzinger (IL)
Capps	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Capuano	Esty	Kuster
Cardenas	Farr	Lance
Carney	Fattah	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Foster	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Lawrence
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Lee
Chu, Judy	Gabbard	Levin
Cicilline	Gallego	Lieu, Ted
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Clarke (NY)	Gibson	LoBiondo
Clay	Graham	Loebach
Cleaver	Graves (MO)	Lofgren
Clyburn	Grayson	Lowenthal
Cohen	Green, Al	Lowe
Cole	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham
Collins (NY)	Grijalva	(NM)
Connolly	Guthrie	Lujan, Ben Ray
Conyers	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Cook	Hahn	Lynch
Cooper	Hanna	Maloney
Costa	Hastings	Carolyn
Costello (PA)	Heck (NV)	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Heck (VA)	Marino
Crowley	Higgins	Matsui
Cuellar	Himes	McCollum
Cummings	Honda	McDermott
Curbelo (FL)	Hoyer	McGovern

NOT VOTING—9

Barton	Lewis	Wasserman
Buck	Payne	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)	
Hinojosa	Wagner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1846

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 235, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

AYES—186

Abraham	Buchanan	DesJarlais
Aderholt	Bucshon	Duncan (SC)
Allen	Burgess	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Byrne	Ellmers (NC)
Amodei	Calvert	Farenthold
Babin	Carter (GA)	Fincher
Barr	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Barton	Chabot	Fleming
Benishek	Chaffetz	Flores
Billirakis	Clawson (FL)	Forbes
Bishop (MI)	Coffman	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Foxx
Black	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Comstock	Garrett
Boustany	Conaway	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Gohmert
Brat	Crawford	Goodlatte
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gosar
Brooks (AL)	Dent	Gowdy
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Granger

Graves (GA) McClintock
 Graves (LA) McHenry
 Griffith McMorris
 Grothman Rodgers
 Guinta McSally
 Guthrie Meadows
 Harper Messer
 Harris Mica
 Hartzler Miller (FL)
 Hensarling Miller (MI)
 Hice, Jody B. Moolenaar
 Hill Mooney (WV)
 Holding Mullin
 Hudson Mulvaney
 Huelskamp Neugebauer
 Huizenga (MI) Newhouse
 Hunter Noem
 Hurd (TX) Nugent
 Hurt (VA) Nunes
 Issa Olson
 Jenkins (KS) Palazzo
 Johnson, Sam Palmer
 Jones Paulsen
 Jordan Pearce
 King (IA) Perry
 Kline Pittenger
 Knight Pitts
 Labrador Poe (TX)
 LaMalfa Poliquin
 Lamborn Pompeo
 Latta Posey
 Long Price, Tom
 Loudermilk Ratcliffe
 Love Ribble
 Lucas Rice (SC)
 Luetkemeyer Rigell
 Lummis Roby
 Marchant Roe (TN)
 Marino Rogers (AL)
 Massie Rogers (KY)
 McCarthy Rohrabacher
 McCaul Rokita

NOES—235

Adams Denham
 Aguilar DeSaulnier
 Ashford Deutch
 Barletta Diaz-Balart
 Bass Dingell
 Beatty Doggett
 Becerra Dold
 Bera Doyle, Michael
 Beyer F.
 Bishop (GA) Duckworth
 Blumenauer Duffy
 Bonamici Edwards
 Bost Ellison
 Boyle, Brendan Emmer (MN)
 F. Engel
 Brady (PA) Eshoo
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA) Farr
 Bustos Fattah
 Butterfield Fitzpatrick
 Capps Foster
 Capuano Frankel (FL)
 Cárdenas Fudge
 Carney Gabbard
 Carson (IN) Gallego
 Cartwright Garamendi
 Castor (FL) Gibson
 Castro (TX) Graham
 Chu, Judy Graves (MO)
 Cicilline Grayson
 Clark (MA) Green, Al
 Clarke (NY) Green, Gene
 Clay Grijalva
 Cleaver Gutiérrez
 Clyburn Hahn
 Cohen Hanna
 Connolly Hardy
 Conyers Hastings
 Cook Heck (NV)
 Cooper Heck (WA)
 Costa Higgins
 Costello (PA) Himes
 Courtney Honda
 Crowley Hoyer
 Cuellar Huffman
 Cummings Hultgren
 Curbelo (FL) Israel
 Davis (CA) Jackson Lee
 Davis, Danny Jeffries
 Davis, Rodney Jenkins (WV)
 DeFazio Johnson (GA)
 DeGette Johnson (OH)
 Delaney Johnson, E. B.
 DeLauro Jolly
 DeBene Joyce

Rooney (FL) Pallone
 Ross Pascarell
 Rothfus Pelosi
 Rouzer Perlmutter
 Royce Peters
 Russell Peterson
 Salmon Pingree
 Sanford Pocan
 Scalise Scott, David
 Schweikert Serrano
 Scott, Austin Sewell (AL)
 Sensenbrenner Sherman
 Sessions Shimkus
 Simpson Shuster
 Smith (NE) Sinema
 Smith (TX) Sires
 Stewart Slaughter
 Stutzman Smith (NJ)
 Thompson (PA) Speier
 Thornberry Stefanik
 Tipton Stivers
 Trott Swallow (CA)
 Walberg Takai
 Walker Rush
 Walorski Ryan (OH)
 Walters, Mimi Ryan (WI)
 Weber (TX) Thompson (MS)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (IA)

Sánchez, Linda Tiberi
 T. Titus
 Sanchez, Loretta Tonko
 Sarbanes Torres
 Schakowsky Tsongas
 Schiff Turner
 Schrader Upton
 Scott (VA) Valadao
 Pocan Scott, David Van Hollen
 Serrano Vargas
 Sewell (AL) Veasey
 Sherman Vela
 Shimkus Velázquez
 Shuster Visclosky
 Sinema Walden
 Sires Walz
 Slaughter Waters, Maxine
 Smith (NJ) Watson Coleman
 Speier Welch
 Stefanik Wilson (FL)
 Stivers Yarmuth
 Swallow (CA) Young (AK)
 Takai Young (IN)
 Takano Zeldin
 Thompson (CA) Zinke
 Thompson (MS)

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis
 Crenshaw Payne
 Herrera Beutler Smith (MO)
 Hinojosa Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1849

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will
 read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Military
 Construction and Veterans Affairs and Re-
 lated Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016”.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move
 that the Committee do now rise and re-
 port the bill back to the House with
 sundry amendments, with the rec-
 ommendation that the amendments be
 agreed to and that the bill, as amend-
 ed, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
 and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.
 HULTGREN) having assumed the chair,
 Mr. DOLD, Acting Chair of the Com-
 mittee of the Whole House on the state
 of the Union, reported that that Com-
 mittee, having had under consideration
 the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropria-
 tions for military construction, the De-
 partment of Veterans Affairs, and re-
 lated agencies for the fiscal year end-
 ing September 30, 2016, and for other
 purposes, directed him to report the
 bill back to the House with sundry
 amendments adopted in the Committee
 of the Whole, with the recommendation
 that the amendments be agreed to and
 that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
 House Resolution 223, the previous
 question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any
 amendment reported from the Com-
 mittee of the Whole? If not, the Chair
 will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
 question is on the engrossment and
 third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed
 and read a third time, and was read the
 third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I
 have a motion to recommit at the
 desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the
 gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
 Clerk will report the motion to recom-
 mit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Kirkpatrick moves to recommit the
 bill H.R. 2029 to the Committee on Appro-
 priations with instructions to report the
 same back to the House forthwith with the
 following amendment:

In the “Medical Services” account, on page
 27, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert
 “(increased by \$15,000,000)”.

In the “General Administration” account,
 on page 30, line 15, after the first dollar
 amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gen-
 tlewoman from Arizona is recognized for
 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker,
 this is the final amendment to the bill,
 which will not kill the bill or send it
 back to committee. If adopted, the bill
 will immediately proceed to final pas-
 sage, as amended.

As we witnessed last year during the
 VA’s patient access crisis, the VA does
 not have the resources it needs to care
 for our Nation’s veterans. Last year, I
 worked tirelessly with my colleagues
 to pass the Veterans Access, Choice,
 and Accountability Act, which estab-
 lished the VA Choice Program, allow-
 ing our veterans to seek care outside
 the VA when they live too far from a
 VA medical facility or cannot receive
 timely care.

While some improvements in the VA
 patient access have been made, I know
 from listening to the veterans in my
 district and from veterans service orga-
 nizations that veterans are still strug-
 gling to access care. This bill, in its
 current form, underfunds the VA by
 over a billion dollars—a billion dollars.
 The Arizona Department of Veterans’
 Services and the Arizona VFW and vet-
 erans groups all over Arizona and this
 country are opposed to these cuts.

This motion to recommit will pro-
 vide an additional \$15 million for vital
 medical services, long-term care, men-
 tal health treatment, assistance to
 homeless veterans, substance abuse
 treatment, and caregiver support. \$15
 million toward these essential services
 for our veterans is tiny in comparison
 to the drastic cuts to the VA’s budget
 in this bill. This \$15 million is paid for
 by a reduction in administrative ex-
 penses, so this money will go directly
 to providing care for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind my
 colleagues that the VA Choice Program
 will end next year. Whether or not vet-
 erans are given a choice where they
 may receive their care, the VA will
 still need adequate funding and re-
 sources to care for our veterans.

I would also like to remind my col-
 leagues that just 2 months ago we
 learned from another whistleblower
 that the Phoenix VA’s mental health

facility is significantly underresourced. Due to significant understaffing and mismanagement, veterans contemplating suicide and veterans seeking treatment for substance abuse will be unable to receive the immediate care they need. This is horrible and unacceptable.

While it is necessary that we continue to hold the VA accountable, address the VA's management issues, and prevent waste, we will not solve the VA's patient access problem without ensuring the VA has the resources it needs to provide timely and quality care. Veterans will continue to wait if the resources are not there.

If we do not address the lack of VA resources now, we will continue to hear heartbreaking stories from veterans who are unable to receive timely treatment. If the VA Choice Program ends without reauthorization and funding, those veterans will return to the VA, and veterans new to the VA will also need treatment. We will then face another patient access crisis, and this time it will be our fault.

Caring for veterans is a cost of war. Cuts to government spending should not be shouldered by the men and women we have chosen to place in harm's way. We have a moral obligation to ensure these brave Americans who have fought and sacrificed for us receive the health care and the benefits they have earned.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we have a serious responsibility to exercise proper oversight. This bill has long enjoyed broad bipartisan support and was brought up through an open process that allowed all voices to be heard and all opinions to be considered.

Now, I was proud to work in a bipartisan manner with Ranking Member BISHOP on this bill. He is a good friend and a good man and a good partner. We considered, together, 715 Member requests while drafting this bill, of which 562 were from Democratic Members, and we did our best to accommodate the Members on both sides of the aisle. I believe we did. We were successful. We then considered 43 additional amendments, proposals yesterday and all last night. This motion to recommit could have been offered at anytime during this debate, but they chose to do it tonight.

By the way, I should let you know, too, the bill that we are going to be considering passed last year with all but one vote. The bill that we are going to be considering spends 6 percent more than the one last year.

I want to say something about the motion to recommit. It reflects the administration's continuing efforts to deflect their management failures at the VA on the Congress. And the gentle-

lady who just spoke said this bill cuts spending. Well, it does not.

□ 1900

It is a 6 percent increase over last year. It is not a cut.

Yes, I know the administration doesn't want us to talk about the \$930 million cost overrun at the Denver VA medical construction project, and there are others. I know they don't want us to discuss the pervasive neglect and mismanagement at the Philadelphia VA regional office, and of course, they don't want us to discuss the atrocious failure to serve countless veterans in Phoenix.

I know the administration doesn't want us to talk about the cost overruns in Denver, Orlando, or wherever else they may occur—New Orleans. They don't want us to talk about the problems in Philadelphia, where the inspector general, just 2 weeks ago, provided a laundry list of horrible failures.

Most of all, they don't want us to talk about or discuss the atrocious failure to serve countless veterans in Phoenix, many of whom, tragically, paid for the VA's mistakes with their own lives.

The Obama administration has controlled this government for 6 years. It is time that they take responsibility for the VA's failures and allow us to move forward with this bill to increase the services and resources available to our veterans and servicemembers.

For the administration to say they would veto this bill because we provided a 6 percent increase for the VA over enacted levels, instead of a 9 percent increase, is the sort of incendiary threat that can only make sense here in Washington.

Only here in Washington can a 6 percent increase be called a cut. Everywhere else in America, that is called an increase, 6 percent above last year. Congress should not be expected to behave like potted plants and simply accede to the President's request that does not adhere to the budget caps that he signed into law himself.

By the way, just for some numbers, the bill provides \$48.6 billion for VA medical services—\$3.4 billion above last year's level—plus we provide advance funding for fiscal year '17 at \$51.7 billion.

Our bill is a good bill in its current form. It targets the needs of homeless veterans, caregivers who sacrifice their time and livelihood to care for their injured servicemembers, and those veterans waiting too long for decisions on their disability claims.

In all these areas, the bill provides every dollar the administration requested, but that good news story apparently doesn't fit the gloom and doom narrative of this administration which, once again, doesn't want to acknowledge the management failures at the VA, and they are saying a 6 percent increase is a cut.

We know better. The American people know better. The veterans know

better. It is time that we reject this motion and support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 236, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—181

Adams	Foster	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Ashford	Fudge	Napolitano
Bass	Gabbard	Neal
Beatty	Gallego	Nolan
Becerra	Garamendi	Norcross
Bera	Graham	O'Rourke
Beyer	Grayson	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Grijalva	Peters
Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Peterson
F.	Hahn	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bustos	Himes	Quigley
Butterfield	Honda	Rangel
Capps	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Huffman	Richmond
Cárdenas	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Keating	T.
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clay	Kilmer	Schiff
Cleaver	Kind	Schrader
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster	Scott, David
Connolly	Langevin	Serrano
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costa	Lawrence	Sinema
Courtney	Lee	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Cummings	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Loebuck	Takai
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Takano
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Titus
DeLauro	(NM)	Tonko
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Tsongas
Deutch	Lynch	Van Hollen
Dingell	Maloney,	Vargas
Doggett	Carolyn	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Vela
F.	Matsui	Velázquez
Duckworth	McCollum	Visclosky
Edwards	McDermott	Walz
Ellison	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Engel	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Eshoo	Meeks	Welch
Esty	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Moore	
Fattah	Moulton	

NOES—236

Abraham	Guinta	Pearce
Aderholt	Guthrie	Perry
Amash	Hanna	Pittenger
Amodei	Hardy	Pitts
Babin	Harper	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Harris	Poliquin
Barr	Hartzler	Pompeo
Benishek	Heck (NV)	Posey
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Black	Hill	Reed
Blackburn	Holding	Reichert
Blum	Hudson	Renacci
Bost	Huelskamp	Ribble
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rigell
Brat	Hunter	Roby
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jolly	Roskam
Carter (GA)	Jones	Ross
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Rothfus
Chabot	Joyce	Rouzer
Chaffetz	Katko	Royce
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Russell
Coffman	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Cole	King (NY)	Salmon
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Collins (NY)	Kline	Scalise
Comstock	Knight	Schweikert
Conaway	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Cook	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Sessions
Cramer	Lance	Shinkus
Crawford	Latta	Shuster
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Simpson
Culberson	Long	Smith (NE)
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Rodney	Love	Smith (TX)
Denham	Lucas	Stefanik
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
DeSantis	Lummis	Stivers
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Dold	Marino	Thornberry
Duffy	Massie	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Trott
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Turner
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Upton
Farenthold	McKinley	Valadao
Fincher	McMorris	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walder
Fleischmann	McSally	Walker
Fleming	Meadows	Walorski
Flores	Meehan	Walters, Mimi
Forbes	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Mica	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Westerman
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Westmoreland
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Whitfield
Gibbs	Mullin	Williams
Gibson	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Womack
Gosar	Newhouse	Woodall
Gowdy	Noem	Yoder
Granger	Nugent	Yoho
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Young (AK)
Graves (LA)	Olson	Young (IA)
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Griffith	Palmer	Zeldin
Grothman	Paulsen	Zinke

NOT VOTING—14

Allen	Hinojosa	Smith (WA)
Barton	Lewis	Wagner
Bilirakis	Payne	Wasserman
Buck	Pelosi	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (MO)	Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1908

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 255, noes 163, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—255

Abraham	Goodlatte	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gosar	Noem
Aguilar	Gowdy	Nugent
Allen	Graham	Nunes
Amash	Granger	Olson
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Ashford	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Babin	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Barletta	Griffith	Pearce
Barr	Grothman	Perry
Barton	Guinta	Peters
Benishek	Guthrie	Peterson
Bera	Hanna	Pittenger
Bilirakis	Hardy	Pitts
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Poliquin
Black	Hartzler	Pompeo
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Posey
Blum	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Boustany	Higgins	Reed
Brady (TX)	Hill	Reichert
Brat	Holding	Renacci
Bridenstine	Hudson	Ribble
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Brownley (CA)	Hultgren	Roby
Buchanan	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Bustos	Issa	Rohrabacher
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Chabot	Jordan	Ross
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rothfus
Clawson (FL)	Katko	Rouzer
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Cole	King (IA)	Ruiz
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Russell
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Comstock	Kline	Salmon
Conaway	Knight	Sanchez, Loretta
Cook	Kuster	Sanford
Costa	Labrador	Scalise
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Cramer	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	Latta	Sessions
Culberson	LoBiondo	Shinkus
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Shuster
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Simpson
Dent	Lucas	Sinema
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NJ)
Dold	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Marino	Stefanik
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	Stivers
Ellmers (NC)	McCaul	Stutzman
Emmer (MN)	McClintock	Takai
Farenthold	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Fincher	McKinley	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Tiberi
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Tipton
Fleming	McSally	Trott
Flores	Meadows	Turner
Forbes	Meehan	Upton
Fortenberry	Messer	Valadao
Fox	Mica	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Walder
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Walker
Gabbard	Moolenaar	Walorski
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Walters, Mimi
Gibbs	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Wenstrup
		Westerman
		Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—163

Adams	Fudge	Moulton
Bass	Gallego	Mulvaney
Beatty	Garamendi	Murphy (FL)
Becerra	Grayson	Nadler
Beyer	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Nolan
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Norcross
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Boyle, Brendan	Hahn	Pallone
F.	Hastings	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Himes	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Honda	Pingree
Capps	Hoyer	Pocan
Capuano	Huffman	Polis
Cárdenas	Israel	Price (NC)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kildee	T.
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kind	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Conyers	Langevin	Schrader
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Crowley	Lawrence	Lee
Cummings	Lee	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
DeGette	Lipinski	Sires
Delaney	Loeb sack	Speier
DeLauro	Lofgren	Swailwell (CA)
DelBene	Lowenthal	Takano
Denham	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham	Titus
Deutch	(NM)	Tonko
Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray	Torres
Doggett	(NM)	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Lummis	Van Hollen
F.	Lynch	Vargas
Duckworth	Maloney,	Veasey
Edwards	Carolyn	Vela
Ellison	Matsui	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Visclosky
Eshoo	McDermott	Walz
Esty	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Farr	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meeks	Welch
Foster	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Moore	

NOT VOTING—13

Buck	Neal	Wagner
DeFazio	Payne	Wasserman
Herrera Beutler	Slaughter	Schultz
Hinojosa	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Lewis	Thompson (MS)	

□ 1914

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2028.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1917

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 29, line 4.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$167,050,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$167,050,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, over the next decade, the U.S. is set to spend hundreds of billions of dollars operating and upgrading our nuclear arsenal. But in this budget environment, every dollar we spend to keep our outdated and oversized nuclear arsenal functioning is a dollar we aren't spending on other priorities that keep us safe and secure or on reducing our unsustainable debt and deficits. That is why the amendment I am offering with Mr. POLIS will put \$167 million towards deficit reduction by placing funding for the new nuclear-armed cruise missile warhead back on its original 2015 acquisition schedule.

In the FY 2015 budget, production of the warhead was scheduled to begin in 2027, but this year's budget request sped up the development for the warhead by 2 years. This is despite the fact that the existing air-launched cruise missile and warhead isn't being phased out until the 2030s. And there is plenty of uncertainty about whether this program is affordable or even necessary.

Chairman SIMPSON is so concerned about the cost of the warhead that language was included in the E and W report to require a red team assessment on the affordability of the program—and for good reason, given our history of spending large amounts of money on warhead programs that end up getting tabled.

Given the cost concerns over the program, does it really make sense to rush the acquisition process?

Furthermore, as some experts note, there is no longer a need to shoot nuclear cruise missiles from far away

when we have the most advanced bomber ever created in our arsenal, the B-2 stealth bomber, which is capable of penetrating enemy airspace and dropping a nuclear bomb directly above a target. And if we decide we want to shoot nuclear missiles from thousands of miles away, we still have very expensive submarines and very expensive ICBMs capable of doing just that.

So ask yourselves: Should we really be accelerating the development of a warhead that goes on a missile we don't need and could cost hundreds of millions, if not billions, more than anticipated?

I ask my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment to maintain funding at the program's FY 2015 acquisition schedule, and save the taxpayers \$167 million in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Ensuring funding for the modernization of our nuclear weapons stockpile is a critical national security priority in this bill. The bill fully funds the \$195 million needed to initiate a life extension program for the W80 warhead, the only nuclear-tipped cruise missile in the U.S. nuclear arsenal. The life extension program will replace non-nuclear and other components to extend the life of the W80, and to ensure it can be deployed on the Air Force's long-range stand off cruise missile, or LRSO, should that program move forward.

The budget request was considered a 2-year acceleration of the LRSO program, compared to last year's stockpile plan, to meet a defense requirement for deployment in 2030. However, it is clear that there is considerable planning that needs to be accomplished by the administration before Congress can have confidence in these long-term stockpile plans.

While 2030 may seem like many years away, these warheads are very complex, and there is considerable amount of work to accomplish between now and then. Performing additional work earlier in the schedule will allow the NNSA to reduce technical risk and limit any cost growth. The gentleman's amendment would slash funding for this effort, and that will add additional risk and uncertainty to the schedule.

We must do the work that is needed to extend the life of this warhead as long as there is a clear defense requirement for maintaining a nuclear cruise missile capability. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I respect Chairman SIMPSON's request that language be included in the E and W re-

port to require a red team assessment of the affordability of this program. All I am adding to that is, if we have questions about the affordability of this program, a program that is not going to take place for some time, do we really want to accelerate the spending program?

In this budget environment, it does not make sense to accelerate the development of a warhead while, at the same time, requiring an assessment on its affordability. Why would we put more money into a program that may end up getting tabled? Shouldn't we at least wait until the release of the red team report before adjusting the acquisition schedule?

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to please not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. SIMPSON. Again, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

As I said, performing additional work earlier in the schedule will allow the NNSA to reduce technical risk and limit any cost growth while we are finding out about what the red team assessment comes up with. So I think this is important that we defeat this amendment so that we can move forward with modernization of this warhead.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$25,000,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$25,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, we just heard Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. SIMPSON in a debate about this very same issue, and I don't want to cover the exact same ground, but I want to put this in the context of, I think, a very

serious concern that all of us ought to have.

The rebuilding, or what is known as the life extension program for our nuclear bombs, is but one small part, actually, one very large part, but small in comparison to the total reconditioning, rebuilding of our entire nuclear enterprise.

And when you consider the totality of what we are doing in this appropriations bill and last night, when we took up the defense authorization bill, you can only, and you must, come to the conclusion that the United States is now involved in a very significant, total restructuring and rebuilding of our entire nuclear deterrent system. It is not just the six to seven different nuclear warheads that are going to be rebuilt at a cost of several tens of billions of dollars; it is also all of the delivery systems. We are, in fact, engaged in a new nuclear arms race.

Now, many of us grew up in the sixties and seventies—fifties, sixties, and seventies—and I think all of us have a memory of the arms race and all of the drills, hiding underneath the table, all of that trouble. I think we have a memory of what went on with the Cuban Missile Crisis.

When you step back and look at what we are doing in the appropriations bill before us as well as in the National Defense Authorization Act, you must come to the conclusion that we are on the path to spend \$1 trillion over the next 25 to 30 years rebuilding the entire nuclear enterprise. We have, in this bill, all of the nuclear weapons.

In this one, we went from some \$9 million last year for this W80 to over \$190 million in this bill. Yes, there are safeguards and, yes, we ought to pull all of this money back until we decide how this fits into the new cruise missile, the new long-range cruise missile replacing the old variety.

That goes on the new stealth bomber, the LRSO, a new stealth bomber, at \$550 million a copy, more than half a billion dollars a plane. A cruise missile, a new plane doing the exact same thing, and that is to be added to a new Minuteman missile for the silos in the Midwest, the upper Midwest, new Minuteman III missiles.

That will be added to the new submarines that are going out there with new missiles and new warheads and, on top of that, some new stealth technology that is going on that we really can't even talk about.

But it is happening, \$1 trillion in a nuclear arms race that is being replicated by China and Russia, the United Kingdom and France.

What in the world is this world coming to?

This isn't Iran. Iran is a separate issue, significantly important, but this is different. This is the major nuclear-armed countries in the world, all of them, upgrading their nuclear systems.

We have the new bombs, new precision bombs. We have the new delivery system, stealth. It is extraordinarily

dangerous because the hair trigger of the past and all of the rules of the past are now going to be put aside, and now we have a really, really, fine hair trigger.

□ 1930

You won't know but a few minutes ahead of time when it is incoming because it is a stealth bomber or a cruise missile or even a hypersonic missile. And suddenly, there you are; you have got seconds to make a decision about whether you are going to annihilate the world or not. How do you respond to this?

And you have got Russia over there talking about using a nuclear weapon as a deterrent to reduce some sort of standard military conflict. This is an extraordinarily dangerous situation.

I want to draw the attention of the entire House and use this particular effort to reduce this account by \$25 million. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), I think, had a better proposal, and that is to reduce the whole thing.

But here we are. Pay attention, men and women of this House and of the Senate. Pay attention to what the overarching issue is here. It is the opening quarter of a new nuclear arms race among the great powers of the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The bill fully funds the request of \$195 million to initiate a life extension program for the W80 warhead. The life extension program will replace non-nuclear and other components to extend the life of the W80 and to ensure it can be deployed on the Air Force's Long-Range Standoff cruise missile, or the LRSO, should that program move forward.

Certainly, the committee will look to realign the work that needs to be done on the W80 if there are changes to the schedule for the LRSO. But as long as that program stays on track, we need to make sure that the work that needs to be done by the NNSA is properly aligned with those efforts.

The gentleman's amendment would make it more difficult for the NNSA to meet its schedule requirements, and I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$1,918,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided by this Act for Project 99-D-143, Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, and by prior Acts that remain unobligated for such Project, may be made available only for construction and program support activities for such Project. *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances from prior year appropriations available under this heading, \$10,394,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$13,802,000) (increased by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$3,802,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Nebraska and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, it is my understanding that our chairman, Chairman SIMPSON, as well as Ranking Member KAPTUR actually support this amendment. I want to express my gratitude to the chairman for working with me and thinking critically as to how we make our nuclear nonproliferation architecture more robust.

What this amendment does is it moves \$13.8 million from the mixed oxide portion of our nonproliferation account over to the nuclear smuggling and detection account and the research and development account as well.

Nuclear smuggling and detection is an important part of our nonproliferation regimen, and research and development into better techniques to detect the illicit movement of fissile material or technology has to be one of the more robust policy considerations moving forward, not only in this appropriations bill but as a body here, ensuring that we, again, are focused singularly on the nonproliferation threats that are occurring throughout the world as this technology spreads and as fissile material potentially becomes

more available to those who would use it for potentially great harm.

I also want, in the amendment, to point out why this money is taken from the mixed oxide program.

Currently in the bill, we are spending about \$345 million on this program. But MOX is expensive, and its future is unclear. We have to come to some policy decision here. We keep digging this hole and digging this hole. This policy is adrift, and it is costing taxpayers a great deal of money. It is not fair in terms of public policy. It is not fair to taxpayers. It is not fair to the people of South Carolina and Georgia because of this uncertainty.

So we need a decision here. If it is, No, we are not going to proceed with MOX, then we have to develop an understanding of what we are going to do with this material, whether it is blend it down or store it or whether we need to rethink the entire public policy that led us to this point, which is about 20 years old, and whether perhaps this ought to become some sort of international consortium, for instance, to deal with this particular issue and share in the cost.

If the answer is, Yes, we are going to proceed with MOX, then spending \$345 million a year to sort of keep it open, with a little bit extra, and that cost to keep it open—to keep it in cold storage, as we say—is approximately \$200 million, so we throw in a little more on top. It doesn't get us to final completion. It doesn't even really get us on that road.

So the policy here is adrift, and we have got to come to some deeper consideration as to what we are going to do.

The problem with MOX fundamentally is the initial cost was \$1 billion. Now we are looking at \$7 billion. The lifecycle costs are skyrocketing. So some clear, deliberate decision. And if it is "yes," we need to expedite this, and we need to do so in a cost-conscious manner. If it is "no," let's turn to other alternatives quickly so that we can move more of these funds into the robust portions of our nonproliferation regimen, our architecture to ensure that we bring down the probability of a nuclear weapons explosion as close to zero as possible, ensuring as well that we are keeping this material out of others hands.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for taking up this issue. The MOX facility lifecycle cost is now over \$47 billion and at the end of the day will not solve the problem.

The disposition of the unnecessary plutonium stock can be done in other ways. We ought to set aside that money. You are quite correct to put it into nonproliferation issues, trying to figure out where the loose nukes might be around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I will draw your attention and the attention of the gentle-

men and gentlewomen here today that in yesterday's National Defense Authorization Act, those facilities that sense the movement of nuclear materials across borders, the in-place were withdrawn, taken out. We ought to pay attention to that, put those back in in one more piece.

I commend the gentleman for being right on. And we do need to sort out the MOX facility and come to some conclusion; otherwise, we are in a \$47 billion rathole that won't solve the problem.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for trying to work with me. This is a difficult position. The chairman has a very difficult task here of balancing competing ends. I really appreciate the way in which he has artfully drawn together an important bill here. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his efforts in nonproliferation and his strong advocacy for this program and trying to become the expert. And really, he is what I consider maybe one of the foremost experts in the House on nonproliferation issues. I thank both the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from California for their efforts in this area.

It is a challenging issue for us. You know, I was interested to hear the \$47 billion because I have heard \$31 billion. I have heard \$30 billion. There are all sorts of different estimates, and we haven't got the numbers of how they came to these conclusions. And when they look to the alternatives in this report that just came out from the Department, they said, if I remember correctly, the downblend activities had a cost that was much less. But if you look at the downblend alternatives, what they didn't add into it is that you would put that material in WIPP theoretically.

First of all, you would have to get WIPP extended. It is supposed to be closed. So you have got a 15-year extension of what you would have to do. There was no cost in there for the operation of WIPP for those 15 years and what it was going to cost. So we are still having a hard time coming to grips with what the actual cost of the different alternatives are.

This is one of those things that it is frustrating for our committee, I think, over the years for a lot of different things. Where we head down one path, spend billions of dollars, and then all of a sudden, change directions. And it seems like we are throwing money away.

But I am open to looking at what the alternatives are, and I want to look at the numbers behind the report that

came out. But this amendment simply adds and reduces the defense nuclear nonproliferation account by the same amount. Therefore, the language of the amendment doesn't change the amounts directed specifically for the MOX project in the House report, which will continue to be funded at \$345 million.

But I understand both of your concerns. They are concerns I share. And they are concerns we need to address because you are absolutely right. If we are not going to go down this road, we shouldn't be spending \$345 million a year.

Now we are going to spend a bunch of money at the start. Even if you close it down, it is going to cost some money, or if you stop it. So all of that needs to be taken into consideration. But we need to make a determination of what is going to happen with MOX and what we are going to do with this additional plutonium.

Some people have suggested maybe the best thing to do is store it. Of course that violates an agreement that we have with the Russians. So you would have to get their agreement on that. So it is a challenging issue, I will be the first to admit. And we have had a challenge in the committee trying to deal with it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho's concerns and the way he is approaching it is really quite commendable and the right way to go about it. Two studies have been done, the most recent dealing with the \$47 million. That speaks to the current MOX procedure and process. The blending down, you have correctly analyzed the problem there because it doesn't take into account the full cost, and then you have still got to dispose of this stuff someplace.

There is also the vitrification of it, which is blending down, putting it into a glass container, and then storing that. Those have problems.

There is another option that will be analyzed and is coming out later in this year, in September, and that is the use of a fast reactor to actually burn the plutonium and, thereby, make it unusable for weapons. It also would generate a significant amount of energy, which could produce steam and electrical energy along the way. That study is coming out later this year.

In the meantime, we ought to do what you are doing here, and that is, just slow down, take a look at this.

And for those who are concerned about the jobs in the Savannah River area, a lot of this work can be done there in any one of these options. Just don't do something that doesn't work, which is the current process underway. So you could do a fast reactor there. Use that as a method of consuming the plutonium and rendering it useless.

There are many different ways to do it. But we are headed down a rathole. Slow down. Stop.

I commend both the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Idaho for where they are going on this. Carry on.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from California. And I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, again, for his efforts in this area. I know it is a matter of both urgency to the United States and to the world, actually. But I thank the gentleman for his efforts in this arena, and continue on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Again, let me just reiterate my deep thanks to the chairman for his leadership on this. This is a tough one, and he is working aggressively to try to get to the heart of a prudential and good decision.

Let me thank, again, the gentleman from California for his insights and participation as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$125,000,000)”.

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$105,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I want to raise an issue along the lines of my earlier discussion and part of what we just heard in the previous discussion. That is, where are we going with the nuclear enterprise? What is it all about? Where will it take us?

My personal view is that we are in the first quarter of a new nuclear arms race. This amendment deals with a critical part of that effort to rebuild the nuclear weapons systems of the United States.

We currently have maybe 10,000 unused nuclear plutonium pits. This is the heart of a nuclear bomb. It is pure plutonium, and it is the heart of the bomb.

The 10,000 that are not used came out of nuclear weapons that have been dismantled as a result of the various arms control treaties that have been in place over the last 30 years, all to the good. The MOX facility deals with that unused excess plutonium and others. But this amendment deals with the notion of rebuilding and increasing the capacity of the United States to produce new plutonium pits.

□ 1945

We presently have the capacity to produce somewhere between 5 and 10 plutonium pits, again, the heart of a

nuclear weapon, in the existing facilities. We are going to spend a few billion dollars—unknown—but somewhere probably between \$1 billion and \$2 billion or \$3 billion building the facilities to increase the capacity to manufacture these plutonium pits to 50 to 80 a year.

Now, testimony that we have received in the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee indicates that nobody knows what you are going to do with them or whether you even need the pits, but they want to build the facility just in case.

You go: Wait a minute, you have 10,000 out there; what are you going to do? Why are you doing this?

It has never been answered other than: Well, we might need it some day.

Well, God willing, we will never need it some day. Five to 10 a year, more than we need, 50 to 80, the military doesn't know what to do with it; the NNSA doesn't know what to do with it, but they want to build the manufacturing facility even so.

This amendment simply says let's take \$125 million of that and apply it to something useful like cleaning up what is going on out there. Just keep in mind that we are talking about an enormous amount of money here for the production or the manufacturing facilities of these pits.

It is not just the facility for the plutonium, but it is also for the rest of the bombs, so it is probably going to be well over \$10 billion by the time we finish, and then you have the operating costs, if we ever operate at all. Be careful here. We are into a massive expenditure of over \$1 trillion over the next 20 to 25 years.

I have asked the military: Tell us how we are going to spend that.

They say: Well, we really don't know.

They gave me a document that is a bunch of equations with no explanation of what the factors are. I am asking for information. I was shut down in committee yesterday, but we all ought to demand information.

What is going on here? What are we talking about? A new long-range stealth bomber to replace the B-2, new cruise missiles, new submarines, new missiles for land and sea, and new warheads to go on top of it; and, all the while, other countries are trying to match us. It is a nuclear arms race well underway.

Are we causing it? We are clearly part of it. Russia and China are also involved in this and matching technology, spending a vast amount of money. Just think what we could do if we took one-quarter of that and spent it on education. What could we do for the American people? I think I hear the knock-knock of time having run out, and that frightens me because time is running out on this issue, and we need to pay attention here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SIMPSON and his committee for paying attention to all of this.

Ms. KAPTUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Could I just ask for clarification? Which of your amendments are you addressing in your arguments now? It was our understanding the gentleman was addressing the MOX facility. Are you addressing that or your prior amendment?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am addressing the facilities, the nuclear pit facilities, the plutonium pit facilities. It is \$125 million. The MOX was my colleague from Nebraska's amendment. That was his amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment you are speaking to on the pit production is an end of the bill amendment, and we are not yet at the end of the bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So I can come back and do it again?

Mr. SIMPSON. There you go. The amendment that was reported by the Clerk was the MOX facility that took \$125 million out of the MOX facility.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. That was the amendment that was reported by the Clerk.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is what I was speaking to.

Mr. SIMPSON. You have another amendment that deals with pit production?

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I can go back and talk about the MOX facility now. I stand corrected.

The 125 was the MOX facility amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Our arguments and the debate that we just had with the gentleman from Nebraska about the MOX facility and the challenges that we face in the MOX facility is the same as the debate we just had, and while we asked for the Department to look at the two alternatives, the downblend and the continuing MOX, the Armed Services Committee asked for a report on all five of the alternatives that they were looking at and the cost and stuff.

I would oppose this amendment of taking \$125 million out of the MOX facility.

Mr. CLYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, if we are, in fact, about to entertain the MOX amendment, I would love to speak in opposition to that amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. This is the amendment that has been reported.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If the gentleman would yield for 15 seconds, I will explain the error, and then I will be out of the way.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Quite correct, there was an error on my part.

This is the question of the MOX facility, \$125 million to be applied to other cleanup programs across the Nation. That is it. I spoke on a different issue, and the MOX facility came up earlier.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I oppose this amendment. I do so because I really believe that this amendment would endanger our national security by making harmful cuts to the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility that is located in South Carolina.

This facility will be used to dispose of 34 metric tons of weapons grade plutonium according to binding international agreements originally signed back in 2000 and reaffirmed in 2010. Most of the plutonium has already been transferred to the Savannah River site, and it is there awaiting disposition through the MOX facility.

The President has requested the level of funding included in this bill to continue construction. The facility is over 65 percent complete and supports over 1,500 highly skilled jobs. Any further delay will jeopardize our international agreements and will abandon commitments that the country has made to the State of South Carolina when we signed and agreed to house these dangerous materials for our Nation.

I want to close by saying South Carolina has developed what I call a level of tolerance for nuclear. It didn't get there, as we say down in Gullah Geechee country, just by itself. We got there because of the commitment we made to this Nation years ago with the Manhattan Project.

I believe the State of South Carolina and the Savannah River site have made significant commitments to helping secure this Nation. I believe we would be breaking faith with the State to cripple this effort at this time because it is an agreement, the agreements are international, and I think we have a commitment to the State of South Carolina to continue the movement on this project.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be opposed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee which has jurisdiction over the NRC, our committee has taken a close look at the regulatory priorities and resource needs of the commission.

The Energy and Power Subcommittee oversees nuclear energy, and the Environment and Economy Subcommittee has oversight on nuclear waste. I serve on both subcommittees.

In both committee and subcommittees, we have held hearings in recent years with the commissioners on the NRC, as well as other experts and stakeholders. In these hearings, we have learned important facts such as, while the Nation's fleet of nuclear reactors continues to operate safely, the evidence clearly demonstrates that the NRC's budget exceeds what is reasonably necessary in light of current regulatory and licensing needs. We have further learned that—and the NRC Chairman recently acknowledged—the NRC budget needs to be right-sized to some degree.

We have also focused on the fact that, unlike most other Federal agencies, 90 percent of the NRC's budget is recovered through fees on nuclear licensees, which are eventually paid through electric rates.

This means that an outsized NRC budget is actually paid for by the American people, both through their taxes and their electric rates. We have also seen recent closures of nuclear power plants in the United States and fewer new plants coming online than anticipated a decade ago. In fact, even though the number of nuclear plants is currently decreasing, the NRC budget has increased substantially compared to 10 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee and the chairman for acting to provide a level of appropriations for the NRC that is appropriate under the circumstances. This budget gives the NRC all it needs to ensure the safe operation of the Nation's nuclear fleet without asking taxpayers and electricity ratepayers to pay more than is necessary.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his interest in this subject. I can assure you that the subcommittee is very concerned also, and we look forward to working with you and your committees as we try to right-size the NRC and all of the budgets that we will be doing in the future.

As you said, the NRC is well aware of the fact that they need to right-size themselves as they try to attempt to implement their Project Aim 2020, so I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, \$1,320,394,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$43,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,426,400).”

Page 30, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,500,000).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Rhode Island and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would support beginning an assessment of the feasibility of using low-enriched uranium in naval reactor fuel that would meet military requirements.

Using low-enriched uranium in naval reactor fuel could yield significant potential national security benefits related to nuclear nonproliferation, could lower security costs, and supports naval reactor research and development at the cutting edge of nuclear science.

As we continue to face the threat of nuclear terrorism and as countries continue to develop naval fuel for military purposes, the imperative to reduce the use of highly enriched uranium will become increasingly important over the next several decades. This is the time to begin investments in new technologies to address proliferation threats and to reduce reliance on highly enriched uranium.

R&D on LEU for naval reactors would also support continued R&D within Naval Reactors at the cutting edge of nuclear science and engineering, which remains a critical capability. The Naval Reactors director Admiral Richardson testified on March 24, 2015, before the House Armed Services Committee that, with current technology, using low-enriched uranium fuel would only be feasible for aircraft carriers and would require an additional refueling at a cost of \$1 billion. He added, however:

The potential exists that we could develop an advanced fuel system that might increase uranium loading and make low-enriched uranium possible while still meeting very rigorous performance requirements for naval reactors on nuclear-powered warships.

Mr. Chairman, this \$2.5 million in funding would support early testing and manufacturing development required to advance LEU technology for use in naval fuel. Such a program, if

successful, could yield significant benefits for nuclear nonproliferation and yield security cost savings.

Mr. Chairman, it sounds like we have broad-based support for this amendment. I urge acceptance of this amendment in order to start this very important effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2000

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LAN-GEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for Federal Salaries and Expenses in the National Nuclear Security Administration, \$388,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$12,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed one fire apparatus pumper truck and one armored vehicle for replacement only, \$5,055,550,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$281,951,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

DEFENSE URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities for Department of Energy contributions for uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning activities, \$471,797,000, to be deposited into the Defense Environmental Cleanup account which shall be transferred to the "Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund".

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses, necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, and classified activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$767,570,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount, \$253,729,000 shall be available until September 30, 2017, for program direction.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are approved for the Shoshone Paiute Trout Hatchery, the Spokane Tribal Hatchery, the Snake River Sockeye Weirs and, in addition, for official

reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$5,000: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2016, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and for marketing electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$6,900,000, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, up to \$6,900,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southeastern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$66,500,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and for marketing electric power and energy, for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500 in carrying out section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the Southwestern Power Administration, \$47,361,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), up to \$35,961,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$11,400,000: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$63,000,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (ex-

cluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, \$307,714,000, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500, to remain available until expended, of which \$302,000,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), and section 1 of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939 (43 U.S.C. 392a), up to \$214,342,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended, for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the Western Area Power Administration: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$93,372,000, of which \$87,658,000 is derived from the Reclamation Fund: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$352,813,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures: *Provided further*, That, for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred (excluding purchase power and wheeling expenses).

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, \$4,490,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 2 of the Act of June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 255): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of that Act and of 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$4,262,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration from the sale of power and related services from the Falcon and Amistad Dams shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of funding the annual expenses of the hydroelectric facilities of these Dams and associated Western Area Power Administration activities: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated for annual expenses shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$228,000: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this appropriation, annual expenses means expenditures that are generally recovered in the same year that they are incurred: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2016, the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration may accept up to \$460,000 in funds contributed by United States power customers of the Falcon and Amistad Dams for deposit into the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund, and such funds shall be available for

the purpose for which contributed in like manner as if said sums had been specifically appropriated for such purpose: *Provided further*, That any such funds shall be available without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission for the sole purpose of operating, maintaining, repairing, rehabilitating, replacing, or upgrading the hydroelectric facilities at these Dams in accordance with agreements reached between the Administrator, Commissioner, and the power customers.

**FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For expenses necessary for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$3,000, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$319,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$319,800,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and used for expenses necessary in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0.

**GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT
OF ENERGY**

**(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSIONS OF
FUNDS)**

SEC. 301. (a) No appropriation, funds, or authority made available by this title for the Department of Energy shall be used to initiate or resume any program, project, or activity or to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals or similar arrangements (including Requests for Quotations, Requests for Information, and Funding Opportunity Announcements) for a program, project, or activity if the program, project, or activity has not been funded by Congress.

(b)(1) Unless the Secretary of Energy notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 3 full business days in advance, none of the funds made available in this title may be used to—

(A) make a grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling \$1,000,000 or more;

(B) make a discretionary contract award or Other Transaction Agreement totaling \$1,000,000 or more, including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation;

(C) issue a letter of intent to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

(D) announce publicly the intention to make an allocation, award, or Agreement in excess of the limits in subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress within 15 days of the conclusion of each quarter a report detailing each grant allocation or discretionary grant award totaling less than \$1,000,000 provided during the previous quarter.

(3) The notification required by paragraph (1) and the report required by paragraph (2) shall include the recipient of the award, the amount of the award, the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated, the account and program, project, or activity from which the funds are being

drawn, the title of the award, and a brief description of the activity for which the award is made.

(c) The Department of Energy may not, with respect to any program, project, or activity that uses budget authority made available in this title under the heading “Department of Energy—Energy Programs”, enter into a multiyear contract, award a multiyear grant, or enter into a multiyear cooperative agreement unless—

(1) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award; or

(2) the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement includes a clause conditioning the Federal Government's obligation on the availability of future year budget authority and the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 3 days in advance.

(d) Except as provided in subsections (e), (f), and (g), the amounts made available by this title shall be expended as authorized by law for the programs, projects, and activities specified in the “Bill” column in the “Department of Energy” table included under the heading “Title III—Department of Energy” in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act.

(e) The amounts made available by this title may be reprogrammed for any program, project, or activity, and the Department shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 30 days prior to the use of any proposed reprogramming that would cause any program, project, or activity funding level to increase or decrease by more than \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, during the time period covered by this Act.

(f) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that—

(1) creates, initiates, or eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(2) increases funds or personnel for any program, project, or activity for which funds are denied or restricted by this Act; or

(3) reduces funds that are directed to be used for a specific program, project, or activity by this Act.

(g)(1) The Secretary of Energy may waive any requirement or restriction in this section that applies to the use of funds made available for the Department of Energy if compliance with such requirement or restriction would pose a substantial risk to human health, the environment, welfare, or national security.

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of any waiver under paragraph (1) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after the date of the activity to which a requirement or restriction would otherwise have applied. Such notice shall include an explanation of the substantial risk under paragraph (1) that permitted such waiver.

SEC. 302. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be available to the same appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Available balances may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 303. Funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2016 until the enact-

ment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016.

SEC. 304. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used for the construction of facilities classified as high-hazard nuclear facilities under 10 CFR Part 830 unless independent oversight is conducted by the Office of Independent Enterprise Assessments to ensure the project is in compliance with nuclear safety requirements.

SEC. 305. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to approve critical decision-2 or critical decision-3 under Department of Energy Order 413.3B, or any successive departmental guidance, for construction projects where the total project cost exceeds \$100,000,000, until a separate independent cost estimate has been developed for the project for that critical decision.

SEC. 306. Notwithstanding section 301(c) of this Act, none of the funds made available under the heading “Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science” may be used for a multiyear contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement of \$1,000,000 or less unless the contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or Other Transaction Agreement is funded for the full period of performance as anticipated at the time of award.

SEC. 307. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any prior Act under the heading “Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation” may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to, the Russian Federation.

(b) The Secretary of Energy may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that such activity is in the national security interests of the United States. This waiver authority may not be delegated.

(c) A waiver under subsection (b) shall not be effective until 15 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress, in classified form if necessary, a report on the justification for the waiver.

SEC. 308. (a) NOTIFICATION OF STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE DRAWDOWN.—None of the funds made available by this Act or any prior Act, or funds made available in the SPR Petroleum Account, may be used to conduct a drawdown (including a test drawdown) and sale or exchange of petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve unless the Secretary of Energy provides notice, in accordance with subsection (b), of such exchange, or drawdown (including a test drawdown) to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

(b)(1) CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION.—The notification required under subsection (a) shall include at a minimum—

(A) the justification for the drawdown or exchange, including—

(i) a specific description of any obligation under international energy agreements; and

(ii) in the case of a test drawdown, the specific aspects of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to be tested;

(B) the provisions of law (including regulations) authorizing the drawdown or exchange;

(C) the number of barrels of petroleum products proposed to be withdrawn or exchanged;

(D) the location of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve site or sites from which the petroleum products are proposed to be withdrawn;

(E) a good faith estimate of the expected proceeds from the sale of the petroleum products;

(F) an estimate of the total inventories of petroleum products in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve after the anticipated drawdown;

(G) a detailed plan for disposition of the proceeds after deposit into the SPR Petroleum Account; and

(H) a plan for refilling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, including whether the acquisition will be of the same or a different petroleum product.

(2) **TIMING OF NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall provide the notification required under subsection (a)—

(A) in the case of an exchange or a drawdown, as soon as practicable after the exchange or drawdown has occurred; and

(B) in the case of a test drawdown, not later than 30 days prior to the test drawdown.

(c) **POST-SALE NOTIFICATION.**—In addition to reporting requirements under other provisions of law, the Secretary shall, upon the execution of all contract awards associated with a competitive sale of petroleum products, notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the actual value of the proceeds from the sale.

(d)(1) **NEW REGIONAL RESERVES.**—The Secretary may not establish any new regional petroleum product reserve unless funding for the proposed regional petroleum product reserve is explicitly requested in advance in an annual budget submission and approved by the Congress in an appropriations Act.

(2) The budget request or notification shall include—

(A) the justification for the new reserve;

(B) a cost estimate for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of the reserve, including funding sources;

(C) a detailed plan for operation of the reserve, including the conditions upon which the products may be released;

(D) the location of the reserve; and

(E) the estimate of the total inventory of the reserve.

SEC. 309. Of the amounts made available by this Act for “National Nuclear Security Administration—Weapons Activities”, up to \$50,000,000 may be reprogrammed within such account for Domestic Uranium Enrichment, subject to the notice requirement in section 301(e).

SEC. 310. (a) Unobligated balances available from appropriations for fiscal years 2005 through 2010 are hereby permanently rescinded from the following accounts of the Department of Energy in the specified amounts:

(1) “Energy Programs—Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy”, \$16,677,000.

(2) “Energy Programs—Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability”, \$900,000.

(3) “Energy Programs—Nuclear Energy”, \$1,665,000.

(4) “Energy Programs—Fossil Energy Research and Development”, \$12,064,000.

(5) “Energy Programs—Science”, \$4,717,000.

(6) “Power Marketing Administrations—Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration”, \$4,832,000.

(b) No amounts may be rescinded by this section from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, notwithstanding 40 U.S.C. 14704, and for expenses necessary for the Federal Co-Chairman and the Alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger

motor vehicles, \$95,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100-456, section 1441, \$29,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000, notwithstanding sections 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), 382M, and 382N of said Act, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998: *Provided*, That funds shall be available for construction projects in an amount not to exceed 80 percent of total project cost for distressed communities, as defined by section 307 of the Denali Commission Act of 1998 (division C, title III, Public Law 105-277), as amended by section 701 of appendix D, title VII, Public Law 106-113 (113 Stat. 1501A-280), and an amount not to exceed 50 percent for non-distressed communities.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Northern Border Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses, notwithstanding section 15751(b) of title 40, United States Code.

SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission in carrying out activities authorized by subtitle V of title 40, United States Code, \$250,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, \$1,003,233,000, including official representation expenses not to exceed \$25,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$25,000,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not more than \$9,500,000 may be made available for salaries, travel, and other support costs for the Office of the Commission, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which, notwithstanding section 201(a)(2)(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5841(a)(2)(c)), the use and expenditure shall only be approved by a majority vote of the Commission: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$862,274,000 in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more

than \$140,959,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be for university research and development in areas relevant to their respective organization's mission, and \$5,000,000 shall be for a Nuclear Science and Engineering Grant Program that will support multiyear projects that do not align with programmatic missions but are critical to maintaining the discipline of nuclear science and engineering.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$12,136,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$10,060,000 in fiscal year 2016 shall be retained and be available until September 30, 2017, for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2016 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2016 appropriation estimated at not more than \$2,076,000: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, \$958,000 shall be for Inspector General services for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, which shall not be available from fee revenues.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100-203, section 5051, \$3,600,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act, \$1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017: *Provided*, That any fees, charges, or commissions received pursuant to section 106(h) of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act (15 U.S.C. 720d(h)) in fiscal year 2016 in excess of \$2,402,000 shall not be available for obligation until appropriated in a subsequent Act of Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

SEC. 401. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall comply with the July 5, 2011, version of Chapter VI of its Internal Commission Procedures when responding to Congressional requests for information.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

SEC. 502. (a) None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriations Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(b) None of the funds made available for any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may be transferred to accounts funded in title III of this Act, except pursuant to a transfer made by or transfer authority provided in this Act or any other appropriations Act for any fiscal year, transfer authority referenced in the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this Act, or any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality.

(c) The head of any relevant department or agency funded in this Act utilizing any transfer authority shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress a semiannual report detailing the transfer authorities, except for any authority whereby a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government may provide goods or services to another department, agency, or instrumentality, used in the previous 6 months and in the year-to-date. This report shall include the amounts transferred and the purposes for which they were transferred, and shall not replace or modify existing notification requirements for each authority.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order No. 12898 of February 11, 1994 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations).

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to conduct closure of adjudicatory functions, technical review, or support activities associated with the Yucca Mountain geologic repository license application, or for actions that irrevocably remove the possibility that Yucca Mountain may be a repository option in the future.

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547 of July 19, 2010.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 506. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transform the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, there have been efforts to privatize and consolidate the National Energy Technology Laboratory, also known to us as NETL. This amendment is offered to

eliminate that uncertainty of privatization and to continue the present public-private partnership.

NETL is our Nation's premier energy laboratory for fossil energy, using 600 government scientists, technicians, and employees, but they couple that with nearly 1,200 private sector contractors. Through this partnership, NETL has developed breakthrough research, carbon capture, enhanced natural gas exploration and production, emission control for our power plants, and steam and gas turbine efficiency.

Having NETL government owned and operated also maintains that the research that they produce will not be proprietary and is available to all utility companies. Small utility companies in rural America where I come from would potentially suffer the most from a move towards privatization, and they would no longer be able to perform this research and be forced to buy the new technologies at very high costs.

Mr. Chairman, who would end up paying these high costs? The limited customers of these small companies through higher electric bills.

People looking to privatize and consolidate these laboratories seem to be searching for a solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment would prevent the Department from transforming the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close NETL.

NETL does important research in support of a balanced energy portfolio that will increase the efficiency and safe usage of abundant natural resources in this Nation.

I appreciate my colleague's passion for this issue, and I have no objection to this amendment being included in the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BABIN

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation" may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that require the Islamic Republic of Iran to cease the pursuit, acquisition, and development of nuclear weapons technology.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying that I strongly support programs and operations that are funded by the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation section of the underlying bill.

Keeping loose nuclear materials—especially from places like the former Soviet Union states—out of the hands of America's enemies is one of the most important duties of the Department of Energy and the Federal Government as a whole. That being said, Congress has the obligation to set requirements and criteria for every dollar of taxpayer money that we spend, especially funds that are sent or used overseas. In fact, my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee already exercised this judgment with an additional provision in their bill that is very similar to the amendments that I will be offering today.

Section 307 of the underlying bill specifically prohibits any DOE nonproliferation funds from being used to enter into new contracts or agreements with Russia, sending a strong signal to Mr. Putin and others that there are real consequences for their irresponsible and destabilizing actions of the last few years.

My amendment adds this section to the end of the bill:

"None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading 'Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation' may be made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that require the Islamic Republic of Iran to cease the pursuit, acquisition, and development of nuclear weapons technology."

If the last line of my amendment sounds familiar, it should. It is the very same language that Congress defined as total disarmament of Iran's weapons of mass destruction program when it passed the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010. That bill passed the Senate by a vote of 99-0 and in the House 408-8, and only two of the Members who voted "no" on that bill still serve here in Congress today.

There is a lot to be worried about in President Obama's deal with Iran, but two serious concerns trump all of the others:

First, how will Iran properly deal with and dispose of 14,000 centrifuges

and 9,700 kilograms of highly enriched uranium that they are supposed to give up?

And if they are serious about not pursuing a bomb, what are they planning to do with the 6,000 centrifuges and 300 kilograms of uranium that they get to keep under this deal?

On the first question, the Web site Vox, hardly a rightwing outlet, says that the disposal of these materials is an open question and that the negotiators punted on how to safely and effectively remove this material from Iran. Given that fact, there is every reason to believe that the DOE nonproliferation account could be used for this purpose.

The second question is even more troubling than the first. Michael Morrell, former Director of the CIA, said back in February that “the potential Iran nuclear agreement would limit Iran to the number of centrifuges needed for a weapon but too few for a nuclear power program,” a statement verified as “true” by PolitiFact.

□ 2015

Iran's leaders have repeatedly said they have no interest in developing a nuclear weapon, and over the years, they have made that promise to the international community to gain relief from crippling economic sanctions. I don't trust Iran, but even if I did, I would still say that we follow President Reagan's charge that led us to victory when facing another nuclear foe: trust but verify.

Let me be clear. If Iran proves that they are serious about giving up all of their nuclear ambitions, I fully support using DOE nonproliferation assets to get their nuclear materials safely out of that country. Why, I would write a check myself to make sure that my grandkids don't grow up in a world where loose Iranian nuclear material makes its way to the black market or into the hands of terrorists.

But Iran can't have one without the other. That is why my amendment will make sure that, if DOE signs a contract with Iran to help remove nuclear material from Iran, it will also stipulate that they are giving up all efforts to build a bomb.

This is a commonsense amendment that reiterates the position of Congress and the promises made by President Obama's negotiating team. I urge a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and I share a great desire to prevent the spread of Iran's nuclear capabilities, but the only thing that, unfortunately, your amendment does is endanger security, including America's security.

We can differ on how we work with Iran on the broader issue of conditions for an agreement on sanctions and

their nuclear program, but that is not the issue we are debating here today. What we are debating here today is the nonproliferation program at the Department of Energy. Stopping the spread of dangerous materials from the Republic of Iran is in our Nation's interest regardless of the outcome of the broader discussion.

While there are currently no plans to work in Iran and no funding that directly supports work in Iran, let me give you a few examples of what your amendment would stop, would preclude:

One, the Department of Energy's nonproliferation program might be asked to engage with Iran to facilitate the removal of excess low-enriched uranium or heavy water from Iran. Such an engagement could necessitate contracts to arrange for the packaging, shipment, and disposition of such materials and would be prevented by the proposed amendment.

Second, the Department of Energy's nonproliferation program might also be asked to engage with Iran to strengthen Iran's nuclear safety, nuclear security, or nuclear safeguard practices. Such engagement could require contracts to provide technical expertise or support logistical arrangements and would be prevented by your amendment.

There may be some who want to use any bill, including our bill, to make political points, but shouldn't we be more concerned about endangering American lives and the lives of other innocents around the world? Wouldn't you prefer that this material be under lock and key in the United States, for example, or with one of our allies than have it stored in Iran? I can only speculate that our security practices are much better.

This amendment has no place in this bill, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, yes, I would still earnestly urge an “aye” vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BABIN

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee call up amendment No. 4.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading “Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation” may be used to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that include authority for the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct anytime, anywhere inspections of civil and military sites within the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BABIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BABIN. My amendment is similar in nature to the one just offered, and I want to ensure that my strong support for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program and the good work of the committee to properly fund it is, once again, reflected in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this second amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to make clear to Iran and to the world that the complete, intrusive inspections of all Iran civil and military sites are nonnegotiable and must be part of any deal with Iran.

My amendment adds this section to the end of the bill: “None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ‘Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation’ may be made available to enter into new contracts with or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that include authority for the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct anytime, anywhere inspections of civil and military sites within the Islamic Republic of Iran.”

I was encouraged to see Energy Secretary Moniz, President Obama's chief technical expert in the Iran negotiations, quoted as saying: “We expect to have anywhere, anytime access” to conduct nuclear inspections of Iran.

I share his view that without these full, intrusive inspections there is simply no way to fully and truly verify that Iran is complying with the terms of any deal they supposedly agree to.

Unfortunately, the Iranians do not share the views of our Secretary. Shortly after the Secretary made these comments to Bloomberg News, Iranian Brigadier General Hossein Salami responded by saying:

“Not only will we not grant foreigners the permission to inspect our military sites, we will not even give them permission to think about such a subject. They will not even be permitted to inspect the most normal military site in their dreams.”

Apologists for Iran say that they just need to say these types of things, as well as maintain a limited nuclear stockpile, in order to save face and preserve their national pride.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't come here to help the Iranians with their PR efforts. Neither did you, and neither did anyone in this body. Our job is to keep the

American people and the free world safe, and any deal with Iran that lifts sanctions but is not coupled with strict inspection requirements isn't just not worth the paper it is written on; it will make us less safe.

History can be our guide on this very subject. In one of his biggest but least discussed foreign policy failures, President Clinton in 1994 made a similar "deal" with North Korea that was supposed to end their nuclear ambitions and bring them into the international community.

Sanctions were lifted, but we were given nothing but mischief and deception by the North Koreans in return. International inspectors were obstructed and blocked on a regular basis. North Korea continued to develop their nuclear program, only now in the shadows and in hardened, underground facilities. In 2006, they successfully detonated a nuclear bomb, and they continue to develop and test long-range missiles and to threaten their neighbors and the West. Instead of weakening the authoritarian regime that controls North Korea, the lifting of the sanctions and the development of nuclear weapons allowed the Kims to tighten their grip on the country and pass it along to the next generation.

Congress cannot allow President Obama's flawed deal on Iran to take us down this same path.

Once again, if we are going to use DOE resources and taxpayer money to help Iran clean up the mess created by their nuclear ambitions, it should come with conditions. The most important condition should be that they permit the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct the anytime, anywhere inspections that are so essential to any nuclear reduction agreement.

History and our own Energy Secretary tell us that this deal won't work without robust and full inspections. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment to make sure that those inspections do happen.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to the meaning of inspections that qualify as "anytime, anywhere."

The proponent has failed to fulfill his burden as to the meaning of that term.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I call up the Hudson amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 11.1208 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts under the headings "National Nuclear Security Administration", "Environmental and Other Defense Activities", or "Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, this evening, I offer an amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill that would cut spending back to the fiscal year 2008 level.

While I appreciate the work of the Appropriations Committee in crafting this important bill, I recognize that we should go further to cut reckless spending. Washington has a spending problem, and we can't afford to kick the can down the road any longer.

My amendment makes an across-the-board cut of more than 11 percent to the bill in order to decrease the amount back to the fiscal year 2008 level, saving nearly \$2 billion for the taxpayers.

We are over \$18 trillion in our national debt. This is merely a drop in the bucket, and we owe it to our constituents to cut even more to restore fiscal sanity in Washington. Defense accounts are exempt from this cut because Congress is expected to take up the National Defense Authorization Act in the near future to address those programs.

Mr. Chairman, when I first ran for Congress, I was repeatedly asked: "If you are elected, what programs would you cut?"

The answer I gave was: "First, I would go back to 2008 spending levels, and then we will start cutting."

My amendment does just this. It allows us to return to the point when we can finally get serious about paying down our national debt and saving future generations from economic disaster. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because it is sort of an untargeted proposal, and

our budget in many places on this bill is very tight. We know the net effect will be to reduce jobs and hurt the middle class in a sector where America needs help, and that is energy independence and the modernization of our infrastructure.

The result of the amendment will be less investment in water resource infrastructure all over this country at a time when global trade is increasing. Energy research and development programs, which lead us to future energy, not past energy resources, which create good jobs and have substantial returns on investment, will be harmed.

At a time when unemployed Americans lose jobless benefits and when many young families struggle just to survive, we should be creating jobs and securing the American Dream through investing in our energy future, including innovation and investments in the ground in every "all of the above" energy sector we have, not tearing it down. Just since 2003, the United States has spent \$2.3 trillion in importing foreign petroleum. Think about that one.

This is a vast shift of wealth, and thousands upon thousands of jobs are connected to energy production from our country. This amendment only exacerbates this shift of wealth from the American middle class to offshore. It is not something I support, and I doubt the gentleman really wants to support that.

This bill funds critical water resource projects; it supports science activities necessary to breakthroughs to lead us to a new energy future; and it contributes, importantly, to our national defense through vital weapons, naval reactor research, and the non-proliferation funding we had been discussing earlier this evening.

□ 2030

We must make certain decisions to lead our country forward. There are a lot more people who live in this country than lived here in 2008 or 2003. Also, one of the reasons that we have a little bit of uptick in some of the accounts is, there are actually more American people now, so we have got to do some things in terms of the ports. Our ports silt up. We have got to get that out of there in order that we can get larger ships into our ports carrying more goods.

We can't live in the past. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. Let's take America to the future and not backwards.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment. This bill that we are currently considering meets the budget resolution that was just adopted. We have been cutting discretionary spending for the last 4 years, \$173 billion, as I understand it, over the last 4 years, not in decreases

in the increases, but actual decreases in spending. This goes way too far and makes sweeping changes with broad cuts to the reductions. This is an approach I can't support.

I am particularly concerned about the impact this amendment would have on our critical infrastructure, as mentioned by the gentlewoman from Ohio, and the basic research needs that are prioritized in this bill. While the gentleman has attempted to exclude national security activities, I have got to tell you, in all honesty, national security is not the only thing the Federal Government does. We do do other things. We maintain our waterways and our ports and other activities. This amendment would still have the detrimental impact on the security of nuclear materials at the Idaho National Laboratory. These accounts are very complex, and reductions to each account must be carefully weighed, and that is what this subcommittee has been doing and holding hearings on for the last 4 months.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no." I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just wanted to say to the author of the amendment that I said something to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means today. I think he took it rather lightly, but I said, Here we are discussing our appropriation bills on the floor, and I said, We are trying to balance the budget. I said, But you know what? Your committee is sitting back; there are no revenues on the table, and mandatory spending isn't on the table, and you are trying to take it out of the hides of discretionary spending, which is such a small part of the entire Federal budget. You know what he did? He twirled around and kind of laughed me off and walked toward the back of the Chamber. I didn't think that was a very responsible answer.

So I respect the gentleman being down here tonight, offering his amendment. I would encourage you to talk to the head of the Committee on Ways and Means because to try to get us to shrink even more than we have done in many of our accounts—and, by the way, eleven other appropriation bills coming after us that have been asked to do the same—really isn't fair to the American people.

We need all hands on deck, all hands on deck. So I thank the gentleman for attempting to be responsible, but I really think you ought to look to some of the other committees that are sitting back while the burden is on our committee to make these decisions alone. That isn't right.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I acknowledge the fine point the gentlewoman

made that we can't cut discretionary spending to get ourselves out of debt. She makes two valid points: we need more revenue and we need to address the mandatory spending side. I agree wholeheartedly. We need tax reform to get us more revenue, to get the economy generated, to get people back to work, and we also need to look at saving Social Security and Medicare, shoring them up for future generations and controlling the cost curve. She makes a valid point.

I also want to acknowledge that Chairman SIMPSON and the Committee on Appropriations have actually made real cuts over the last few years. He also makes a valid point that we have actually cut discretionary spending in real dollars. I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, we can do more. I just believe that if you look at the path we are on, we are heading, if we don't spend another dime, toward a horrific debt crisis in this country. We just can't afford to sit back and not deal with that.

I believe we do need to work on the mandatory side for sure because that is the real driver of our debt. But in the meantime, let's go back to pre-stimulus time, let's go back to 2008 spending levels because I don't remember the Federal Government starving for money. I don't remember the Federal Government just barely being able to function because it didn't have enough revenue back in 2008. I think it is prudent for us to do that. It is about jobs, it is about the economy, it is about our future generation, our children and grandchildren who are going to have to actually pay the bills that we are running up right now. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to please support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that required all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternative fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31 of this year.

My amendment echoes the President's memorandum by prohibiting funds in this act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles unless that purchase is made in accord with the President's memorandum.

I have submitted identical amendments to 15 different appropriations bills over the past few years, and every time they have been accepted by both the majority and the minority. I hope my amendment will receive similar support today.

Global oil prices are down. We no longer pay \$147 per barrel, but despite increased production here in the United States, the global price of oil is still largely determined by OPEC. Spikes in oil prices have profound repercussions for our economy. The primary reason is that our cars and trucks run only on petroleum. We can change that with alternative technologies that exist today. The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America, over 635,000 vehicles. More than 50,000 of those vehicles are within the jurisdiction of this bill and being used by the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding the use of ethanol. People there can drive to a gas station and choose whether to fill their vehicle with gasoline or with ethanol. They make their choice based on cost or whatever criteria they deem important. I want the same choice for American consumers. That is why I am also proposing a bill this Congress, as I have done many times in the past, which will provide for cars built in America to be able to run on a fuel instead of or in addition to gasoline. They do it in Brazil. We can do it here, and it would cost less than \$100 per car to do so.

In conclusion, expanding the role these alternative technologies play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage that foreign government-controlled oil companies hold over Americans. It will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers. I am delighted that both my Republican and Democratic colleagues have unanimously supported this bill for the past several years. I ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The amount otherwise made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program" is hereby reduced to \$0.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide a loan under section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise because too often here at the Federal level we find ourselves rewarding or occasionally funding corporations that would do what they do irregardless of what we did at the Federal level. It has been a point of contention with Democratic colleagues. Too often we continue to pay for programs that have outlived their original purpose. I think that too often we find ourselves looking the other way at programs that don't work and/or have wasted tens upon tens of millions of dollars.

It is for those different reasons that I rise to offer this amendment, which would indeed defund the Department of Energy's failed Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing program. Quite simply, it would just do two things: one, it would eliminate the \$6 million in funding that would go to this program, and, two, it would prevent any further lending from this program's unused lending capacity.

The reason I think doing those two things are awfully important is, one, this is, indeed, a case of paying corporations to do what they would already do. Again, this has been a point in the budget debate that we had earlier today from both Republican and Democratic colleagues alike, saying we shouldn't be paying corporations to do things they would already do. Two, this is, indeed, a stimulus era program. However well intended in 2009, it has outlived its purpose, and we are not in the economic situation that we found ourselves in 2009. In fact, this program's authority expired back in 2012, and I think it is a recognition by this Congress of the fact that maybe some of the program hasn't been working so well as to why that has indeed occurred.

Finally, this program has seen real losses; 40 percent of its loans have gone bad. According to a GAO report, they actually wrote up some of those losses. What I might do is just share for one moment with my colleagues, as part of

a government reform look at this program, there was a letter to then Secretary Chu February 28, 2012, from one of the applicants. In it he quotes the chairman of a Fortune 10 company—not 100, but Fortune 10 company, and this is in the reference to the letter—told your former deputy, Jonathan Silver, that this program lacked integrity. That is, it did not have a consistent process and rules against which private enterprises could rationally evaluate their chances and intelligently allocate time and resources against that process.

There can be no greater failing of government than to not have integrity when dealing with its taxpaying citizens. For a variety of reasons, I offer this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I want to share a story. I was out at one of our energy labs in California and walked into a research lab, a Cummins engine was up on the boards. I said, What is going on in here? The answer was, We are trying to understand the science of combustion. I said, You mean it is 2014, and we don't understand that yet? They said, No, Congresswoman, we really don't know what happens inside an internal combustion chamber. They were studying what happens when fuel ignites inside that chamber so they could make it more energy efficient. I was surprised to learn that every single automotive company in this country depends on the results of that research, and Cummins is in the lead.

I want to say to the gentleman, I come from automotive America. When the industry fell to its knees in 2008 because we have never had a trade policy that opens closed markets like Japan and Korea and China, I thought to myself, I never thought I would live to see this day. After the wise decision of a majority of this Congress and the Obama administration, we lifted the automotive industry of this country out of the dregs.

I have watched it recover with vehicles like the Cruze and with the Wrangler, which is leading the list. When I look at what Ford is doing in terms of its EcoBoost engine, I see an industry being reborn in our Nation. The economic growth that comes with it, the incredible muscle that it provides inside the spine of this economy—not tangential growth, but real wealth, real wealth being created, again, across this country in this very important industry—I wouldn't do anything at this point in American history with the closed markets we are facing abroad not to support advanced technology in this country.

What we are competing against in other places are countries disguising themselves as companies, and they are able to subsidize their industry, close

their markets, and prevent even our parts going into their original equipment. We can succeed most importantly by advancing automotive technology, advanced vehicle technology.

□ 2045

This particular program allows the component suppliers, as well as the original equipment, to benefit. I can tell you, though, the companies do research themselves; they don't do the kind of basic research that is necessary to provide the incredible breakthroughs that can come through the Department of Energy.

If I said to you 25 years ago, "Would you believe that 10 percent of gasoline blends are ethanol and renewable fuels," you would probably say, "Congresswoman, you have been staying up too late too many nights of the week."

In fact, it has happened. Now, we are going to move to a 15 percent renewable blend. Who would have thought that would be possible? Who would have thought we could get 40-mile-a-gallon vehicles on the road? We are moving toward that now, flexible fuel. That is not by accident. This program supports just what it says, advanced technology vehicles manufacturing.

Given concerns that have been expressed by my colleagues regarding appropriate oversight of these programs, I think the net effect of your amendment is going to be to eliminate oversight of this program, which I don't think we want to do. I think we want to make it work for America's sake.

I oppose your amendment, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I also have to oppose this amendment. While I appreciate the gentleman's position on the ATVM program, the elimination would hurt Federal oversight of the program of more than \$8 billion in loans already given. The committee recommendations include the \$6 million as a reasonable amount to provide oversight and direction to the existing loan portfolio and no more.

I don't think the gentleman wants to actually eliminate the oversight of the loans that are out there that are going to be running for the next 30 years.

I must oppose the gentleman's amendment in order to ensure that there is proper oversight of taxpayer funding.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman very much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank both of my colleagues for their counterpoints, and I understand absolutely this notion of competitiveness. I agree with Thomas Friedman, the world is flat; and we are in a global competition for jobs, capital, and way of life.

Look at, again, the fundamentals of this program. I have here a GAO—Government Accountability Office—report

that says the cost of participating in this program outweighs the benefits to companies. That is a GAO report, not a private sector report, not a rightwing report.

I think it is also interesting, in pulling this letter that was, again, written by a supplicant to the agency itself, said that the due diligence process in their attempt—and they ultimately quit—but their attempt to get a loan was more than 1,175 days. His point in this letter was that that was more than tenuous and, frankly, had much to do with their ultimately ceasing and desisting.

I would also make this point: they have only made five loans. If we were depending on these five loans for innovation in new technology in the way that internal combustion engines work or the way that we burn fossil fuel, we are in real trouble, but five loans is what we are talking about.

I would also make this point: I think, at some point, given the scarcity of resources that we do deal with in Washington, D.C., we have to at some level make a divide between big companies. Ford's market cap is \$63 billion. Alcoa's is \$16 billion.

Would not these funds be better used going to small innovators, as opposed to these large, multinational corporations that I think, in many cases, are the beneficiary of corporate largesse, but corporate largesse that I don't think serves the taxpayer well or, according to these industry analysts, the industry as well?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLEAVER

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. During fiscal year 2016, the limitation relating to total project costs in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) shall not apply with respect to any project that receives funds made available by title I of this Act.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would waive the limit on total costs for Army Corps projects which are set forth in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

The law states that a project cannot be funded by more than 20 percent of the project's total authorized cost. This amendment would waive that limitation for any project that receives funds made available by title I of this act.

Thirty or so years have passed since Congress originally authorized many of the current Federal flood control projects. Unfortunately, the large backlog of projects, incremental funding by Congress, and unforeseen circumstances has resulted in costly delays for projects across this country, pushing many over the now outdated authorized limits. Many of these projects are so close to the finish line, and this language could help them cross it.

Mr. Chairman, this language is vital to the continuation of valued flood control projects in my congressional district. The Dodson Industrial District project in Kansas City, Missouri, has completed its first three phases. However, without an increase in its authorized total cost, the project cannot move forward on the final phase.

Currently, the area has a floodwall unconnected to the rest of the project and investments of \$250 million at risk. If the project could be fully funded at the increased total amount, it could be completed in fiscal year 2017.

Projects that have reached their 902 limit can apply for a project cost modification. However, the application and review process routinely takes several years to get approval from the Army Corps headquarters. These valued projects, in which the Federal Government has already invested millions of dollars, are languishing for 2, 3, or more years during that review process.

Another control project in Kansas City, called Turkey Creek Basin, has over \$200 million in investment protected by this project, including a major interstate highway. It was authorized in 1999 and is ready for the final phase, but did not receive Federal funding last year or in this year's budget request because of a pending cost modification application, which began in 2013.

Mr. Chairman, just in my district, there are three flood control projects that have pending cost modification applications that were started in 2013. I can only surmise that this trend has continued in just about every other congressional district in the country.

Mr. Chairman, these are not exotic projects. These are projects which will help generate the businesses in those areas to a point where they can begin to grow.

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their at-

tention to this matter. With some assurances that the committee will try to address this issue as the bill moves into conference process, I would consider withdrawing the amendment at any time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

“An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.”

The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment explicitly supersedes existing law by waiving section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 with respect to certain projects covered by the bill.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that actually maintains current law.

Since its passage in 2007, I have heard from tens of thousands of constituents about how the language in the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act will take away consumer choice when deciding what lightbulb to use in your home. In fact, they are right.

While the government has passed energy efficiency standards in other realms over the years, they have never jumped so far and lowered standards so drastically. It is to a point where technology is still years away from making lightbulbs that are compliant with the

law at a price point that the average American can afford.

Opponents to my amendment will claim that the 2007 language does not ban the incandescent bulb. That is true. It bans the sales of the 100-watt, the 60-watt, and the 45-watt bulbs. The replacement bulbs are far from economically efficient, even if they are energy efficient. A family living paycheck to paycheck can't afford to replace every bulb in their house at even \$5 a bulb.

The economics of the lightbulb mandate are only part of the story. With the extreme expansion of Federal powers undertaken by President Obama and the Democrats in Congress during the first 2 years of the Obama administration, Americans have woken up to just how far the Constitution's Commerce Clause has been manipulated from its original intent. The lightbulb mandate is a perfect example of this.

The Commerce Clause was intended by our Founding Fathers to be a limitation on Federal authority, not a catchall nod to allow for any topic to be regulated by Washington; indeed, it is clear that the Founding Fathers never intended this clause to be used to allow the Federal Government to regulate and pass mandates on consumer products that do not pose a risk to human health or safety.

This Congress must be on the side of consumers and consumer choice. If new, energy-efficient lightbulbs save money and are better for the environment, we should trust the American people to make that choice on their own and move to these bulbs. We should not be forcing these lightbulbs on the American public.

The bottom line is the Federal Government has no business taking away the freedom of Americans to choose what bulb to put in their homes. I will add that, recently, the lightbulb manufacturers in this country have claimed that, because of the stopgap provision in the 2007 law, if we continue to prevent the Department of Energy from promulgating rules pursuant to these provisions, the manufacturers will be forced to stop manufacturing compliant incandescent bulbs.

This is actually an argument to repeal the 2007 language in its entirety, not to allow it to be implemented. We should not allow a stopgap trigger in the law to extort us into passing bad policy and moving forward.

This exact amendment has been accepted for the past 3 years by a voice vote and has been included in the annual appropriations legislation signed into law by the President each year since its first inclusion. It allows consumers to continue to have a choice and to have a say about what they will put in their homes. It is common sense.

Mr. Chairman, I should add that I have had conversations with my good friend, Mr. JORDAN from Ohio, on this amendment. I understand that there have been discussions about changes to the language in order to balance both

the philosophical belief that this is the wrong policy for our country and the pragmatic belief that we should do no harm to the livelihoods of our constituents.

I continue to offer, as I did last July, to sit down with Mr. JORDAN or anyone else to see if compromise language can be achieved prior to the end of the fiscal year, but in the meantime, I offer this amendment to the body.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment. I think it is absolutely the right thing to do. It is pure common sense.

As you know, these newer bulbs, while they may be more energy efficient, they are much more expensive. I have yet to see one that costs less than \$3 or \$4. The incandescent bulbs—when you can find them—you can get four for \$2.50 or something like that.

This is a commonsense approach to let the consumer choose. Certainly, for lower-income Americans that don't have the ability to buy the more expensive bulbs, it makes a lot of economic sense.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2100

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I strongly oppose this damaging rider by my good friend, Congressman BURGESS of Texas, because it would block the Department of Energy from implementing or enforcing commonsense energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs. This rider was a bad idea when it was first offered 4 years ago, and it is even more unsupportable now.

Every claim made by proponents of this rider has been proven wrong. Dr. BURGESS told us that the energy efficiency standards would ban incandescent lightbulbs, but that simply is false. You can go to the store today and see shelves of modern, energy-efficient incandescent lightbulbs that meet the standard. They are the same as the old bulbs, except that they last longer, use less electricity, and save consumers money.

We have heard for years that the energy efficiency standards restrict consumer choice. But if you have shopped for lightbulbs lately, which I have, you know that isn't true either. Modern incandescent bulbs, compact fluorescent lightbulbs, and LEDs of every shape, size, and color are now available. Consumers never had more choice.

The efficiency standards spurred innovation that dramatically expanded

options for consumers. Critics of the efficiency standards claimed that they would cost consumers money. In fact, the opposite is true. When the standards are in full effect, the average American family will save about \$100 every year. That is \$13 billion in savings nationwide every year. But this rider threatens those savings, and that is why consumer groups have consistently opposed this rider.

Here is the reality. The 2007 consensus energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs were enacted with bipartisan support and continue to enjoy overwhelming industry support. U.S. manufacturers are already meeting the efficiency standards.

The effect of the rider is to allow foreign manufacturers to sell old, inefficient lightbulbs in the United States that violate the efficiency standards. This is unfair to domestic producers who have invested millions of dollars in U.S. plants to make efficient bulbs that meet the standards.

Why on Earth would we want to pass a rider that favors foreign manufacturers who ignore our laws and penalize U.S. manufacturers who are following our laws?

But it even gets worse. The rider now poses an additional threat to U.S. manufacturing. The bipartisan 2007 energy bill required the Department of Energy to establish updated lightbulb efficiency standards by January 1, 2017. It also provided that if final updated standards are not issued by then, a more stringent standard of 45 lumens per watt automatically takes effect. Incandescent lightbulbs currently cannot meet this backstop standard.

This rider blocks the Department of Energy from issuing the required efficiency standards and ensures that the backstop will kick in. Ironically, it is this rider that could effectively ban the incandescent lightbulb.

The Burgess rider directly threatens existing lightbulb manufacturing jobs in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, to name but three. It would stifle innovation and punish companies that have invested in domestic manufacturing. This rider aims to reverse years of technological progress, only to kill jobs, increase electricity bills for our constituents, and worsen pollution.

It is time to choose common sense over rigid ideology. It is time to listen to the manufacturing companies, consumer groups, and efficiency advocates who all agree this rider is harmful. I urge all Members to vote "no" on the Burgess lightbulb rider.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I would just observe, at the end of calendar year 2007, the commentator George Will observed the United States Congress had two jobs: deliver the mail and defend the border. It had done neither. But what it had done was ban the incandescent bulb, perhaps the greatest invention ever invented by an American inventor.

This is a commonsense amendment. It deserves passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits" and identified by regulation identification number 1904-AC87.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to stop overbearing Department of Energy regulations from driving up the cost of ceiling fans and increasing energy consumption as a result. I offer this amendment, along with my colleagues Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee and Mr. ROKITA of Indiana, both of whom have been very engaged on this issue.

The Department of Energy is currently considering a proposed rule, entitled, "Standard Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits," which would impose increased efficiency requirements for ceiling fans sold in the United States. This regulation, if implemented, would have the effect of increasing the cost of ceiling fans, in some cases by nearly double, thereby reducing the purchase and use of ceiling fans by American consumers. The end result, ironically, would be heavier reliance on central air-conditioning and, thus, increased energy consumption.

Ceiling fans, by their nature, are already an extremely energy-efficient method of cooling a home or a business, using between 20 and 100 watts during operation, compared with a central A/C unit which typically uses between 3,500 and 5,000 watts. That is an order of magnitude less energy, which can save a household up to 14 percent on cooling costs.

The Department of Energy's proposed standard is regulatory solution in search of a problem.

Now, the ceiling fan industry has already demonstrated a strong commitment to energy efficiency, as evidenced by the dramatic increase in ENERGY

STAR certified ceiling fans on the market over the past decade. The industry continues to develop energy-saving innovations, such as a redesigned motor, which uses up to 70 percent less electricity than the traditional ceiling fan motor. This has all taken place absent the heavy hand of government regulation.

At a time when homeowners across the United States are trying to reduce energy usage and cost, we should not increase the price of ceiling fans by setting unrealistic and unnecessary efficiency requirements on an already efficient product. Ceiling fans can help reduce dependence on foreign energy sources and ease the strain on our national power grid during the time of year when it is most heavily taxed.

Madam Chairman, I would simply state that ceiling fans are an inexpensive, easy way to reduce cooling costs, and the Federal Government should avoid taking actions that will stifle innovation and, ultimately, drive consumers to less efficient methods of cooling their home and business.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to stop this burdensome government regulation, and encourage reduced energy consumption through increased efficiency.

Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chairman, I want to thank Mr. DENT and Mr. ROKITA for their work on this issue.

The Department of Energy is so determined to redesign the ceiling fan that they have released a 101-page rule-making framework document which evaluates the potential energy savings of their new regulations.

Well, what we have found is that, just like stretching their tentacles into lightbulbs and so many other areas of our home, what they are doing is pricing people out of the ceiling fan market. These new regulations would significantly impair the ability of ceiling fan manufacturers like Hunter Fans in Memphis, Tennessee, to produce reasonably priced, highly decorative fans.

The regulations will not only place a higher price tag on the less-pleasing designs, but could increase homeowners' reliance on cooling systems that are less energy efficient.

What we are seeing is, with ceiling fans, that many of our constituents save as much as 14 percent on their energy use to cool their home, and they can save homeowners as much as 40 percent of their air-conditioning bills by creating a breeze that makes the room feel a little bit cooler. New regulations will curb increased consumer trends in the marketplace, which currently include placing ceiling fans in laundry rooms, closets, and master bathrooms.

I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DENT. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her continued work on this matter.

Frankly, as I look around the room tonight, I think it is kind of ridiculous that we are sitting here talking, standing here talking about ceiling fans. This is what it has come to.

The bureaucracy in this town is now telling the American people that they know what belongs on their ceiling more than those people do. It is government run amuck. It is an example of the complete disregard bureaucrats have for the practical implications of the regulations they issue.

The Department of Energy, as is stated, contends that a certain amount of energy would be saved by requiring greater efficiency from ceiling fans, completely disregarding the fact that if you price people out of this market, as the gentlewoman from Tennessee said, they are going to have to buy cooling systems that are even more expensive, buy fans that are even more expensive.

Let's get out of this business. We have more important things to do than worrying about bureaucrats and what they decide people need on their ceilings. Let's remember, this amendment was adopted in 2014 on the floor, and it was in the base text of the 2015 bill.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I oppose the gentleman's amendment, given it is a solution in search of a problem.

Since their implementation, standards for ceiling fans and ceiling fan light kits have saved American consumers—are you ready?—\$4.5 billion—in energy costs, and cut greenhouse gas emissions by 22 metric tons.

Nearly a decade ago—why do we have this system? Because three States—California, Maryland, and New York—created their own unique standards for ceiling fan test procedures and performance, and these varying requirements created difficulties for manufacturers marketing products across all 50 States.

In response, the fan manufacturing industry asked the Federal Government for a national standard that would reduce unnecessary complexity. Since that time, the DOE, Department of Energy, has not even proposed a new rule on ceiling fans, so it is premature to react to what might be in a new rule. Even if a new rule is proposed, implementation is years away.

The Department's analysis so far has shown that options exist for increasing

ceiling fan efficiency that are cost-effective for manufacturers and the consumers. Any upgrades will enable consumers to save money by saving energy, also moving our country closer to its low-carbon future.

Given the proposed rule has yet to be released, industry cannot anticipate how much their manufacturing costs might increase, whether their business model would be turned upside down, or whether the rule would result in energy growth. Industry has not substantiated any of their claims.

The Department of Energy has conducted extensive consultation with industry stakeholders, including the companies themselves, and any potential indirect effects on air-conditioning units.

The amendment ensures that consumers will be stuck with less efficient fans and higher energy costs. I can't see why we would want to do that.

Let's help this industry. As I have stated, I object to the amendment as proposed and urge a "no" vote by my colleagues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 2101 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238b) or section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the DeFazio-Poe-Napolitano amendment.

I sincerely thank Ranking Member DEFazio and, of course, the ranking member of the committee for offering this critical amendment which implements the harbor maintenance allocation formulas that were carefully negotiated and included in the WRRDA 2014 and passed the House by a vote of 412-4. I repeat, 412-4.

WRRDA '14 said that any funds appropriated for the harbor maintenance account above \$898 million—of course this was the baseline amount appropriated in fiscal year '12—should be—it doesn't say "would be," "could be"—it should be allocated based on the following parameters:

Ten percent at least goes to the Great Lakes. At least 10 percent goes to expanded uses at donor ports, which

would be New York/New Jersey, Miami, Seattle, Tacoma, Los Angeles, and Long Beach. Expanded uses are berth dredging, removal of contaminated sediment, environmental remediation, and/or subsidies to shippers to continue to use their ports. At least 5 percent goes to underserved harbors. Ten percent goes for emerging harbors.

The 2016 Corps budget does not—I repeat, does not—include the WRRDA 2014 harbor maintenance trust allocations. It does not include them.

This amendment is needed to require the Corps to implement these funds allocations, as directed by Congress.

Madam Chairman, this amendment is especially important to provide fairness to my State of California and to other ports.

All ports in California only receive 15 percent—this is all ports—back of what their shippers paid into that harbor maintenance trust fund.

Last year, the users of the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach alone paid \$263 million in harbor maintenance taxes and received zero—I repeat, zero—back in harbor maintenance funds. This is terribly unfair, and it is, as far as we are concerned, illegal.

This amendment will ensure that it brings back a little bit of that fairness to the donor harbors by providing them with a small portion of what they paid into the system.

I do want to add that this amendment is supported by the American Association of Port Authorities and the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

I ask for support of the DeFazio amendment. I request a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STIVERS

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Cape Wind Energy Project on the Outer Continental Shelf off Massachusetts, Nantucket Sound.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Chair, the amendment I am offering tonight is simple. It prohibits funding for the Cape Wind project off Nantucket Sound. This amendment was offered last year and was accepted unanimously, and I hope it will be again.

The problem with this project isn't that it is renewable energy. We all support renewable energy. This is a renewable energy that is not supporting American jobs. In fact, they have

outsourced their turbines to Denmark and their turbine platforms to Germany.

The other issue is, this project has been quite controversial, and I think that we don't want another Solyndra.

This amendment was adopted last year by a voice vote. I would urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOX) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DISAPPROVAL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 231, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 43

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress disapproves of the action of the District of Columbia Council described as follows: The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Act 20-593), signed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia on January 25, 2015, and transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act on March 6, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for the purpose of controlling the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unfortunately, our thoughts this evening have to be with the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, who could not be here due to ongoing events in his Baltimore district, but his statement strongly opposing H.J. Res. 43 will be entered into the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, resentment does not begin to relate our response to this unprecedented disapproval resolution. Republicans this evening continue their war on women, but this time, they have added men in the District of Columbia for good measure.

This resolution is wildly undemocratic. It is a naked violation of the Nation's founding principle of local control of local affairs, and it is profoundly offensive to D.C. residents.

This resolution uniquely targets my district, but every Member will get to vote on it except for me, the District's elected Representative.

Notwithstanding its late-night consideration, Democrats will make sure Americans understand this inflammatory resolution. For the first time ever, the House is voting to license employers to discriminate against employees for their private, constitutionally protected reproductive health decisions.

For the first time in a quarter of a century, the House is voting to overturn the law of a local jurisdiction. The D.C. bill stops employers from job discrimination based on the reproductive health decision of employees, their spouses, or their dependents.

To name just a few of the horrors permitted by this resolution: employers may fire a woman for having an abortion due to rape or a man for using condoms. Or to use actual examples in the United States today, Emily Herx of Indiana was fired for using in vitro fertilization to become pregnant. Jennifer Maudlin of Ohio was fired for having nonmarital sex and becoming pregnant. Christina Dias of Ohio was fired for using artificial insemination to become pregnant. Shaela Evenson of Montana was fired for using artificial insemination to become pregnant. Michelle McCusker of New York was fired for having nonmarital sex and becoming pregnant.

The D.C. bill is constitutional and legal.

Under the U.S. Constitution, laws may limit religious exercise if they are neutral, generally applicable, and rationally related to a legitimate governmental interest. The D.C. bill applies to all employers, does not target religion, and promotes workplace equality.

Under the Federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act, laws may substantially burden religious exercise if they further a compelling governmental interest in the least restrictive means. D.C. has a compelling interest in eliminating discrimination, and the D.C. bill is the least restrictive means to do so.

The D.C. bill certainly protects religious liberty. The bill is subject to constitutional and statutory exceptions to discrimination laws.

The narrow constitutional ministerial exception allows religious organizations to make employment decisions for ministers and ministerial employees for any reason whatsoever.

The exception in title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which I enforced as chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, permits religious organizations to make employment decisions based on religion.

□ 2130

D.C. law permits religious and political organizations to make employment decisions based on religion and political views; thus, employers in D.C. may continue to make employment decisions based on their religious and other beliefs, and their employees must be willing to carry out the employer's mission and directives with no exceptions.

The D.C. bill does not require employers to provide health insurance; instead, it requires equal treatment of employees. Both the text and the legislative history of the D.C. bill make that clear.

Nevertheless, when Members of Congress express concerns, the D.C. government, in order to eliminate any doubt, passed a new version of the bill that says, "This act shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to reproductive health decisions."

This provision is in effect now, but, under the Home Rule Act, a D.C. bill is not final until the end of the congressional review period. How absurd is that?

This disapproval resolution is a deliberate abuse of congressional authority over the district. In 1973, Congress passed the Home Rule Act to give the district the authority to legislate on local matters with a few enumerated exceptions and "to relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters." D.C. employment and reproductive health laws are not among those exceptions.

This evening, Madam Speaker, I ask my Republican colleagues to live up to their own recently passed fiscal year 2016 budget which calls for the Federal Government to let States and cities govern their own affairs.

"America is a diverse nation. Our cities, States, and local communities are best equipped and naturally inclined to develop solutions that will serve their populations. But far too often, local leaders are limited by numerous Federal dictates," so said the Republicans in their own budget this very year.

I ask the majority to live up to its professed principles of local control and of local affairs, Federalism and limited government. I urge Members to vote "no" on the disapproval resolution to protect employees' reproductive health decisions, to protect workplace equality, and to protect the District's right to self-government as tax-paying American citizens.

I insert in the RECORD the President's veto threat on this resolution.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 43—DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014

(REP. BLACK (R-TN) AND 46 CO-SPONSORS)

The Administration strongly opposes H.J. Res. 43, which would overturn the District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (the Act). The Act added reproductive health decisions to the list of employment non-discrimination protections included under the basis of sex, which had previously included pregnancy, childbirth, related medical conditions, and breastfeeding. By taking away this newly-added protection, H.J. Res. 43 would undermine the reproductive freedom and private health care decisions of the citizens of the District of Columbia. This legislation would give employers cover to fire employees for the personal decisions they make about birth control and their reproductive health. These personal decisions should not jeopardize anyone's job or terms of employment.

The Act preserves the current exception in the District's Human Rights Law for religious entities and does not impose additional requirements on employers, contrary to their personal beliefs, to provide insurance coverage related to reproductive health decisions.

H.J. Res 43 would also have the unacceptable effect of undermining the will of District of Columbia citizens. While the Home Rule Act of 1973 created a procedure for the Congress to overturn laws passed by the District of Columbia, the Congress has not exercised this authority in over two decades and should refrain from doing so in this circumstance, as well. The Administration urges the Congress to adopt the President's FY 2016 Budget proposal allowing the District to enact local laws and spend local funds in the same way as other cities and States.

If the President were presented with H.J. Res. 43, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto this resolution.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we are here today for two reasons: one, our constitutional duty assigned to us by the Constitution; and, two, to maintain the protections that same document ensures for all Americans.

First, the Constitution mandates Congress oversee the District of Columbia. Article I, section 8, clause 17 makes clear Congress exercises “exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District” of Columbia.

In that vein, Congress passed the Home Rule Act, which gives the District some autonomy, but Home Rule also retains the constitutional duty imposed on Congress to be the ultimate signoff for all of the District’s legislation. That responsibility could not be more important than today.

The D.C. Council recently passed legislation that affects the hiring practices of organizations that work to advance certain beliefs. As passed, the bill fails to acknowledge certain longstanding constitutional protections of the First Amendment for political and religious organizations. Because of this, we cannot let this legislation stand.

Former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray requested the council postpone its vote on the bill because of its legal problems. In a December 2014 letter, Mayor Gray explained D.C.’s attorney general found that the bill “raised serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993.”

He went on to say, “Religious organizations, religiously affiliated organizations, religiously driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and Religious Freedom Restoration Act grounds for challenging the law’s application to them.”

To remedy these problems, the Mayor requested the council include an exemption to “protect the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act are designed to secure.”

Madam Speaker, I will insert Mayor Gray’s December 2, 2014, letter to the D.C. Council into the RECORD.

While the council postponed the vote, they took none of the Mayor’s advice. Once again, Mayor Gray wrote the council, again, in mid-December voicing his disapproval for the bill.

In that letter, he suggested, “If the council wishes to adopt this bill, it should clarify the D.C. Human Rights Act’s existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that that exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act are designed to secure.”

Mayor Gray concluded that, “Without this language, I cannot support the legislation and believe that the council would expose the District government to costly legal challenges by moving forward.”

Again, Madam Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD Mayor Gray’s December 17, 2014, letter to the D.C. Council.

Despite these warnings, the council and Mayor Bowser ignored the former Mayor’s requests, passed the bill, and

sent it to Congress. If they had taken Mayor Gray’s advice, we would not be here today.

Madam Speaker, this law is contrary to the Federal statute, and the D.C. Council knows it. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed in 1993 prevents the government from creating any law, rule, or regulation that prevents an individual from freely exercising their religion.

Based on this mandate, the Supreme Court recently held that certain corporations are not required to provide health insurance coverage for contraceptive methods that violate their religious beliefs.

From the way it was drafted, it is unclear if the D.C. bill violates this mandate, making it unconstitutional. Both Mayor Bowser and the D.C. Council know that this is a problem.

In fact, in February, Mayor Bowser admitted that the bill was ambiguous and requested the council pass temporary emergency legislation clarifying that the bill doesn’t require employers to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions.

Madam Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD Mayor Bowser’s February 2, 2015, letter to the D.C. Council.

Madam Speaker, that fix was only temporary and does not address the constitutional concerns I share with Mayor Gray. Given this ambiguity and no permanent fix, the bill is unconstitutional and cannot stand, given the recent Supreme Court decision in *Hobby Lobby*.

Protecting the freedoms guaranteed by our First Amendment should not be a partisan issue. Mayor Gray knew this and pointed this out to the council that it has gone too far.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to speak directly to the claims that this resolution is somehow an attack on women’s health care or their rights to use contraceptives. These attacks are offensive and are patently false.

As a registered nurse, I have spent my adult life bringing health care to women, children, and families. This resolution would in no way threaten anyone’s access to care or freedom from discrimination based on the use of contraceptives; rather, it simply maintains the status quo in Washington, D.C., before this misguided law was passed.

Women are already protected from discrimination on the basis of pregnancy status and a number of other fronts through both D.C. and Federal law, as they should be.

Specific to concerns regarding how this would impact women using contraceptives, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission makes clear “an employer could not discharge a female employee from her job because she uses contraceptives.” Those protections would in no way be impacted if any resolution were to be signed into law.

Madam Speaker, the RHND law is fundamentally dishonest. It purports to be a nondiscrimination act, but it

directly targets the fundamental First Amendment freedoms of employers in our Nation’s Capital, the very city charged with protecting those same freedoms.

We must act to protect religious freedom and to offer relief from this oppressive RHND law.

THE “DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOTS 36, 41 AND 802 IN SQUARE 3942 AND PARCELS 01430107 AND 01430110 EMINENT DOMAIN EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014”

I urge the Council to approve the potential use of eminent domain to acquire Lots 36, 41 and 802 in Square 3942 and Parcels 01430107 and 01430110 (W Street Site). DC Water currently operates a site south of N Place, S.E., north of the Anacostia River and between 1st and Canal Streets, S.E. (DC Water Site). The District plans to revitalize and develop a portion of the DC Water Site and leverage other District investments, such as the South Capitol Street Bridge project and the Nationals Park, and serve to accelerate and promote economic vitality in the Capitol Riverfront neighborhood.

The District of Columbia and DC Water have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding for DC Water to relocate a portion of the uses from the DC Water Site to a site in Prince Georges County. In order to ensure adequate response times to water and sewer emergencies, DC Water must also maintain a site west of the Anacostia River.

The W Street Site is currently occupied by a trash transfer station, and has been considered by many as blight to nearby communities.

READING AND VOTE ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION
BILL 20-790, THE “REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014”

I urge the Council to postpone voting on this measure until significant legal concerns expressed by the Office of Attorney General are resolved. My staff shared with the Committee on the Judiciary a detailed review of the bill by OAG that deemed the legislation legally insufficient. The District of Columbia Human Rights Act (Human Rights Act) protects many facets of an individual’s identity (such as race, nationality, religion, and sexual orientation) from discrimination. Bill 20-790, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, would expand these restrictions by prohibiting employers (and others) from discriminating against an individual based on that individual’s reproductive health decisions.

According to OAG, the bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA). Religious organizations, religiously-affiliated organizations, religiously-driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law’s applicability to them. Moreover, to the extent that some of the bill’s language protects only one sex’s reproductive health decisions, that language may run afoul of the Fifth Amendment’s equal protection guarantee. If the Council wishes to adopt this Bill or similar legislation, it should clarify the Human Rights Act’s existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that the exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and RFRA are designed to secure.

While I applaud the goals of this legislation, as currently drafted, this legislation is legally problematic. I am committed to working with the Council on language necessary to make the changes needed.

BILL 20-48, THE "CIVIL ASSET FORFEITURE AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014"

I support passage of this legislation in Final Reading. Bill 20-48 creates a free-standing title for civil forfeitures, which includes sections on seizures, notice, contesting seizure, interim release of seized property, filing a complaint, forfeiture proceedings, return of property, disposal of forfeited property, adoptive seizures, reporting requirements, remission or mitigation, and the rule of lenity.

While I continue to have reservations about the limitations this bill places on the Executive Branch and the Office of the Attorney General (OAG), I recognize that the forfeiture of civil assets—and procedures for their timely return to the owner—is a significant one in the community that is in need of reform. OAG and the U.S. Attorney's Office worked with the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety on this legislation and was successful in making significant improvements to the requirements included in the legislation. I appreciate the work that the Committee has undertaken to include affected parties, and believe that while this compromise is a good one, future Executives may have to amend the law if the District experiences challenges with the procedures the law puts in place.

BILL 20-468, THE "LIMITATION ON THE USE OF RESTRAINTS ACT OF 2014"

With the amendments circulated on Monday, December 1, I support passage of this measure. Bill 20-468 limits the use of restraints on a woman or youth who is known to be pregnant or in post-partum recovery, including in limited circumstances while in transport to a medical facility or while receiving treatment at a medical facility.

The District of Columbia is considered a national leader in its treatment of pregnant inmates, and I support codifying existing procedures to continue to be a model to other state penal institutions. However, I do not want to overly burden the administration of our detention facilities with procedures that are unsafe both to inmates and corrections officers. The amendment being offered today strikes that balance.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. GRAY.

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LOTS 36, 41 AND 802 IN SQUARE 3942 AND PARCELS 01430107 AND 01430110 EMINENT DOMAIN AUTHORIZATION EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014" AND ACCOMPANYING DECLARATION AND TEMPORARY VERSION

I urge the Council to approve this legislation giving the Mayor authorization to utilize eminent domain to secure District ownership of property in Ward 5 that has long been a source of community complaint. This authorization is supported by the surrounding neighborhood community. Further, it does not mandate the use of eminent domain. Councilmember McDuffie and I agree that having this tool available to the incoming Administration will be helpful in finalizing the future of the site.

READING AND VOTE ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION
BILL 20-790, THE "REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2014"

I appreciate that the Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety has worked with the Office of the Attorney General to make the bill legally sufficient. However, it is my understanding that additional language which would correct significant legal concerns will not be offered today.

While I support the intent of the bill, without the amendment, the Bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA). Religious organizations, religiously-affiliated organizations, religiously-driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law's applicability to them. Moreover, to the extent that some of the Bill's language protects only one sex's reproductive health decisions, that language may run afoul of the Fifth Amendment's equal protection guarantee.

If the Council wishes to adopt this Bill or similar legislation, it should clarify the Human Rights Act's existing exemption for religious and political organizations to ensure that the exemption protects the religious and political liberty interests that the First Amendment and RFRA are designed to secure. Without this language, I cannot support the legislation and believe that the Council would expose the District government to costly legal challenges by moving forward.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. GRAY.

"H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY DECLARATION RESOLUTION OF 2015;" "H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;" AND "H STREET, N.E., RETAIL PRIORITY AREA CLARIFICATION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015"

I urge the Council to support this legislation. The "Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Support Act of 2014" and subsequent emergency legislation amended the Bladensburg Road, N.E., Retail Priority Area and included it into the H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area. The "H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area Incentive Emergency Amendment Act of 2014" amended the criteria for eligible retail development projects eligible to receive grants, but ambiguity remains on the clarity and accuracy of the legislation amending the criteria for eligible retail development projects eligible to receive grants. This emergency legislation addresses those immediate concerns before the next grant cycle, which concludes at the end of February 2015.

"REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY DECLARATION AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;" "REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION EMERGENCY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015;" AND "REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION CLARIFICATION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2015"

Finally, I would like to draw the Council's attention to legislation circulated by the Chairman on my behalf to address legal concerns in Bill 20-790, the "Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014." The attached emergency legislation, which was circulated on Friday, January 30, will repeal and replace language from the underlying bill to make clear that it does not impose any new insurance requirements on employers related to reproductive health decisions. This emergency legislation ensures that the District will remain in compliance with Federal and Constitutional law. I urge the Council to agendize the emergency at its next legislative meeting.

Thank you for the opportunity to express the Administration's views on these pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER.

Chairman Phil Mendelson at the Request of the Mayor

A BILL IN THE COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To amend, on an emergency basis, the Human Rights Act of 1977 to provide a clarification that the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision.

Be it enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia, That this act may be cited as the "Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Clarification Emergency Amendment Act of 2015".

Sec. 2. Reproductive health choices clarification.

(a) Section 105(a) of the Human Rights Act of 1977, effective July 17, 1985 (D.C. Law 6-8; D.C. Official Code § 2-1401.05(a)), is amended as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of interpreting this act, discrimination on the basis of sex shall include, but not be limited to, discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, related medical conditions, breastfeeding, or reproductive health decisions; provided that this act shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision."

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I point out that, far from not discriminating, I have named five women in five different States who have been discriminated against because of language precisely of the kind the District of Columbia bill needs to avoid.

It is true that the former Mayor and the former attorney general had some issues with the bill. They are no longer in office. Nevertheless, the current Mayor and the current city council have reviewed those issues.

May I say that the Mayor never offered any examples of the kind of interference with religious or other rights. He was referring to the council, and the Mayor, nevertheless, reviewed his objections, and unanimously, the D.C. City Council and Mayor Bowser have, in fact, endorsed this bill.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

This is a new low in the war on women. Women have been fired for using in vitro fertilization and fired for being pregnant before they are married. This isn't some hypothetical or a cautious story from the 1950s. This is happening in America in the 21st century.

The D.C. Council voted unanimously to protect workers from this type of discrimination because it understands what House Republicans must not, that employees should be judged by their performance, not their reproductive healthcare choices.

Madam Speaker, hard-working women already have enough on their plate, from making 78 cents on the dollar compared to men, to acting as caregivers without paid family and medical leave. The majority doesn't even have

the courage to bring up this bill in the light of day.

Congress should be focused on growing the economy and providing opportunity for all Americans, not making women fear that they might be fired if their employer does not approve of contraception or the manner in which they conceive children.

□ 2145

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), the cosponsor of this bill, the chair of the Republican Study Committee, and someone who has worked very hard on this legislation.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to formally disapprove of the recent measure passed by the District of Columbia that clearly violates religious liberty.

I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Tennessee, for her work on this important issue. I urge all of my colleagues to join her in reaffirming Congress' commitment to protecting our First Amendment rights.

Despite its name, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does, in fact, discriminate against those who exercise their right to live according to their religious beliefs. The D.C. measure tells values-based organizations that they may no longer live and work according to the very principles that they advocate. A Christian school would be required to pay for health insurance policies that include provisions that violate the beliefs that they teach their students. In addition, a pro-life organization would be forced to hire individuals regardless of their commitment to pro-life values.

Simply put, the D.C. Council measure compels Americans to act in clear violation of their conscience. In doing so, they ignore the opinion of most Americans, Supreme Court precedent, and the First Amendment to our Constitution.

More than 80 percent of Americans agree that individuals should be free to run their businesses and their organizations according to their beliefs, without the government telling them what to do. In 2013, the Supreme Court upheld that opinion, ruling in *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby* that employers have the right to operate their businesses according to their religious beliefs and principles.

Most importantly, however, the freedom of belief is enshrined in the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. Freedom of belief is the cornerstone of America's founding principles. It was the promise of religious freedom that spurred the first generation of immigrants to come here, and it is the practice of religious freedom that has brought people from all over the world, from all races and creeds, to our shores ever since.

Religious freedom may be one of our oldest tenets and oldest principles, but it is one we must constantly strive and work to defend. This is not about one city or even one piece of legislation. Other cities or States may be considering similar measures, and doing nothing will only embolden those who would violate religious liberty.

We need to make clear, Madam Speaker, where the House stands on this important issue. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join the gentlewoman from Tennessee and me in supporting today's resolution.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to correct the gentleman that the church would have to buy insurance to cover abortion, the church is completely—every church is completely—exempt from this law. Or, as he indicated, that a pro-choice group would have to hire a candidate who believes in abortion, on the contrary, a pro-choice group can ask a candidate if that candidate is willing to carry out the mission of the organization against abortion, and if that candidate has any compunction, that candidate can, indeed, be refused employment; and if such a person is on staff, that person can be fired. You cannot be on somebody's staff and then take a position against the mission of that business or organization.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), my good friend.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this resolution is an insult to women everywhere. What business is it of an employer—or anyone else, for that matter—to know whether or not workers or their daughters are taking birth control? It is absolutely none of their business.

And it also makes a mockery of the majority party's oft repeated claims that it wishes to scale back the overreach of the Federal Government, yet here they are reaching into personal lives.

And the resolution is being proposed by the so-called party of states' rights. They are not proposing a Federal law. They are trying to override the decisions of elected officials in the District of Columbia.

Why should the Congress have the right to override the democratic decisions of people in our Nation's Capital? A city with more people than the State of Wyoming and larger than Vermont gets no voting Senators or Congressman in this body.

This offensive effort to intrude into the most intimate of decisions of a woman's life sends a loud and clear message from the majority that they think a woman's employer does get a say in a woman's reproductive healthcare choices, even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution, and

women all across this country think that they do not.

This resolution would give an employer coercive power to intrude on a woman's private decisions about birth control, in vitro fertilization, and abortion. They are activities that obviously happen off the job and decisions that have no bearing whatsoever on a person's ability to do her job.

The District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does not diminish the right of religious freedom. This new D.C. law is modest in its scope. It simply protects an employee's right to self-determination. It handles a perceived conflict between two differing claims to rights in a simple and straightforward way.

I urge a "no" vote to this new low and public policy.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is an insult to women everywhere.

What business is it of an employer—or anyone else for that matter—to know whether or not workers or their daughters are taking birth control? It is none of your business.

And it also makes a mockery of the majority party's oft repeated claims that it wishes to scale back what it calls the overreach of the Federal government this offensive effort to intrude into the most intimate of decisions of a woman's life—sends a loud and clear message from the Majority that they think a woman's employer does get a say in a woman's reproductive health care choices.

Even though the Supreme Court, the Constitution and women all across the country think you don't.

This resolution would give an employer coercive power to intrude on a woman's private decisions about birth control, in vitro fertilization, and abortion.

They are activities that obviously happen off the job and decisions that have no bearing whatsoever on a woman's ability to do her job.

The District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act does not diminish the right of religious freedom.

This new DC law is modest in its scope—it simply protects an employee's right to self-determination.

It handles a perceived conflict between two differing claims to rights in a simple and straightforward way.

An employer has the right to hold whatever belief his conscience dictates—but he does not have the right to discriminate against employees based on their private choice to use birth control, in vitro fertilization, or abortion.

The DC law received a unanimous vote on the DC Council and was even revised to make it clear that it would not force an employer to provide insurance coverage for contraceptive or abortion coverage.

And while this resolution might just affect women and their families here in our nation's capital, women across the U.S. should be very much alarmed: Because if this resolution stands—Can there be any doubt—they're coming for you next.

I urge my colleagues to consider the ways this resolution would threaten the jobs and economic security of hardworking DC residents, and to oppose this absurd, discriminatory resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who has been a big protector of life and has been a good colleague of mine since our election in 2010.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, and I commend the gentlewoman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Texas for sponsoring this important piece of legislation. This resolution would prevent the District of Columbia from violating America's basic First Amendment freedom of religion.

We must protect pro-life organizations in D.C. and allow them to operate according to their sincerely held beliefs. The D.C. City Council's actions would have serious negative consequences for religious organizations operating in D.C., and religious or pro-life groups could be forced to make personnel decisions that are inconsistent with their moral convictions. Additionally, these actions will force employers to defend against lawsuits of questionable merit brought with a political motivation.

Our Nation's Capital should not be a place where people's freedoms are taken away; it should be a place where the right to live according to your beliefs is most fervently protected. We must respect and protect the religious freedoms established by the Constitution and the Federal law. We must reject the overreach by the D.C. City Council.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I must reject the gentlewoman's desire to protect organizations or residents in D.C. No resident in D.C. has asked any Member of this body to protect them except the Member standing before you, and that Member can't even protect them with a vote on this floor.

This bill was passed unanimously by the D.C. City Council. If there is any objection to this bill, D.C. residents will repair to the courts, who are the only authorities who can tell us what is constitutional and what is not constitutional.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, the distinguished Delegate from the District of Columbia. I thank her for her courageous, relentless, persistent, effective leadership and representation of the District of Columbia.

I come to the floor, Madam Speaker, to ask several questions. I think they have to be addressed to you.

How many times have our Republican colleagues come to this floor to express their belief in reducing the role of government, of the Federal Government? How many times have they come to the floor to preach their deference to states' rights and local government? And how many times have these House Republicans thrown all of that out the window when it comes to meddling, government meddling in the reproductive choices of America's families?

Here we are with Republicans who disapprove a duly passed D.C. law in order to enable businesses to fire their employees for the reproductive health decisions that they make. And not only that, not only the decision that the employee makes, but the decision that a spouse makes or a dependent, a child, makes.

Allowing employers to fire employees for using birth control or in vitro fertilization, which answers the prayers of so many families, or any other reproductive health service is an outrageous intrusion into workers' personal lives.

This is Hobby Lobby on steroids. This is about a business firing someone—man or woman—for private health decisions with no bearing on the workplace. In fact, if Republicans have their way, employers would not need to cite religion at all to discriminate against employees for their reproductive decisions.

House Republicans—and I say House Republicans, Madam Speaker, because this isn't what Republicans think throughout the country. House Republicans need to recognize that personal healthcare choices are not your boss' business. A business has no right to threaten its employees for their reproductive choices or for the reproductive choices made by members of their families.

I keep saying it over and over. House Republicans have no business using this House of Representatives to enable such appalling discrimination. I urge my colleagues to stand against this radical assault on the rights of workers and families here in D.C.

Again, how many times have we seen our House Republican colleagues come to the floor to speak of their belief in reducing the role of the Federal Government? Not so fast, families of the District of Columbia. This doesn't mean you.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is the chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus. He is a co-sponsor of this bill, and he is a defender of life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, let me just say at the outset to my friend, the former Speaker for whom I have the highest regard, it is always appropriate to defend to the best extent possible the fragile lives of unborn children from the violence of abortion, and it is always appropriate

to defend to the greatest degree possible conscience rights when they are under assault. That is why I, along with many of my colleagues, rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to disapprove of D.C. legislation that infringes on the First Amendment freedoms of religious charities and pro-life advocacy groups in the District of Columbia.

I especially want to thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for her consistent and highly effective leadership over many years for fundamental conscience rights and for attempting to respect human life to the greatest extent possible.

□ 2200

I agree with six distinguished law professors—and I will include their letters fully in the Record—who wrote the D.C. Council last November and who said:

"RHNDAs attempt to prevent employers from making decisions based on their 'personal beliefs' implies that the State has the power to judge what are and are not legitimate 'personal beliefs' and to conclude that religiously motivated opposition to State policies is unacceptable. The Supreme Court has unanimously affirmed that employers, not the State, may determine which religious practices they use as the basis for their organization's policies."

The Secretary of Education for the Archdiocese of Washington wrote every Member of Congress, and he said:

"RHNDAs would force religious institutions, including the 20 Catholic schools in the District of Columbia that I oversee, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of the mission of their employer. It would subjugate the church's moral teaching to the moral views of the government."

The National Right to Life Committee, which has its national headquarters right here in the District, said:

"It would be intolerable for an advocacy organization such as ours to be required to hire or prohibit from firing a person who makes a 'decision' to engage in advocacy or any other activity that is directly antithetical to our core mission to lawfully advocate for the civil rights of the unborn."

Christian and Muslim leaders also wrote a letter in which they pointed out:

"We come together to oppose RHNDAs. We believe it would infringe on religious employers' freedom to make employment decisions when necessary to preserve their religious mission and identity."

Catholic University president John Garvey, a very, very distinguished president of Catholic U. and whom I literally had up in hearings to speak out against anti-Semitism, said:

"This bill would require all employers, including religious schools such as ours, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of our mission. It would take away our right to carry

out our mission through personnel policies and practices that are rooted in our faith. The D.C. bill carries no exemption or language of tolerance.”

Again, I would agree with former Mayor Vincent Gray in that it raises serious First Amendment concerns in the Constitution.

APRIL 29, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, I am writing to urge your support of the House Joint Resolution 43, disapproving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act in the United States House of Representatives.

The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act would force religious institutions, including the 20 Catholic schools in the District of Columbia that I oversee, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of the mission of their employer. It would subjugate the Church's moral teaching to the moral views of the government, violating the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and result in discrimination against religious believers. Practically speaking, Catholic schools would be obliged to keep teachers that sow confusion among schoolchildren by engaging in conduct that is contrary to Catholic teaching on the fundamental dignity of human life from the moment of conception. The Archdiocese of Washington has long respected home rule for the District of Columbia and, therefore, advocated for our constitutional rights with the D.C. Council and Mayor. However, they moved forward despite our objections forcing us to appeal to the United States Congress to restore our freedoms.

Accordingly the Archdiocese of Washington joins other religious institutions, faith-based organizations and pro-life advocacy groups urging you and your colleagues to defend our freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of association in the Nation's Capital.

Please vote for House Joint Resolution 43 disapproving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. Thank You.

Sincerely,

THOMAS W. BURNFORD, D.MIN.
Secretary for Education.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, I urge you to vote for House Joint Resolution 43 when it reaches the floor today. The bill would express the House's disapproval of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act passed by the D.C. Council.

That bill would require all employers, including religious schools such as ours, to hire or retain employees who publicly act in defiance of our mission. It would take away our right to carry out our mission through personnel policies and practices that are rooted in our faith.

The D.C. bill carries no exemption or language of tolerance that would acknowledge or accommodate the religious and associational freedoms protected by the First Amendment. It places the preferences of the government above the Church's teaching on important matters.

I recognize the significance of Congress's acting to disapprove a bill passed by the D.C. Council and urge you to take this unusual step only because of the great impact the bill

would have on our ability freely to operate this University. I am grateful for your support

Sincerely,

JOHN GARVEY,
President.

NOVEMBER 5, 2014.

Hon. PHIL MENDELSON,
Council of the District of Columbia,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MENDELSON: We are college and university professors opposed to the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014 (RHNDRA). It seeks to amend Sec. 2, Section 211 (D.C. Official Code §2-1402.11) of the Human Rights Act of 1977, effective December 13, 1977 (D.C. Law 2-38; D.C. Official Code §201401.01 et seq) (the Act) to read: “An employer or employment agency shall not discriminate against an individual with respect to compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of or on the basis of the individual's or a dependent's reproductive health decision making, including a decision to use or access a particular drug, device or medical service, because of or on the basis of an employer's personal beliefs about such services.”

We are convinced that RHNDRA violates the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which governs the District's policies on the restriction of religious freedoms. RFRA is not limited to institutions owned by religious organizations, but extends to closely-held corporations whose owners' free exercise of religion is burdened by state regulation. *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, No. 13-354* (U.S. June 30, 2014).

The Act currently contains an exemption for religious organizations and organizations “operated, supervised or controlled by or in connection with a religious . . . organization” (§2-1401.3). RHNDRA appears aimed at owners of entities like Hobby Lobby, whose owners would seek the same exemption offered religious organizations and their subsidiaries. The standard that RFRA stipulates, that the government may burden religious practice of owners of closely-held corporations only when it is advancing a compelling state interest by means that are the least restrictive to the affected religious practice, is ignored by the proposed legislation.

RHNDRA proposes to overturn the long-standing recognition of the right of religious employers to run their enterprises according to their religious beliefs. RHNDRA's attempt to prevent employers from making decisions based on their “personal beliefs” implies that the state has the power to judge what are, and are not, legitimate “personal beliefs” and to conclude that religiously-motivated opposition to state policies is unacceptable. The Supreme Court has unanimously affirmed that employers, not the state, may determine which religious practices they use as the basis for their organizations' policies. *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC*, 132 S. Ct. 6.

We oppose passage of the RHNDRA and urge you and your colleagues to reject this bill.

Signed,

PROFESSOR GEORGE W.
DENT, Jr.,
Case Western Reserve
University School of
Law.

ROBERT A. DESTRO,
Professor of Law, Co-
lumbus School of
Law, The Catholic
University of Amer-
ica.

JOHN FARINA,

Associate Prof. of Reli-
gious Studies,
George Mason Uni-
versity.

ROBERT P. GEORGE,
McCormick Professor
of Jurisprudence,
Princeton Univer-
sity.

JOHN C. HIRSH,
Professor of English,
Georgetown Univer-
sity.

FRANK A. ORBAN III,
Institute of World Pol-
itics (Ret.).

APRIL 30, 2015.

Re nullify the D.C. “Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination” law.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The National Right to Life Committee, the nationwide federation of state right-to-life organizations, urges you to vote in favor of H. J. Res. 43, a resolution introduced by Congresswoman Black to nullify the so-called “Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act” (RHNDRA) in the District of Columbia. NRLC intends to include the roll call on H. J. Res. 43 in our scorecard of key pro-life votes of the 114th Congress.

The RHNDRA prohibits employers within the District from engaging in “discrimination” on the basis of “decisions” reached by employees, or potential employees, regarding “reproductive health” matters. It is not disputed that abortion is among the matters encompassed by the term “reproductive health” as used in the new law. The scope of the RHNDRA is very broad, covering any “decisions” that are “related to the use . . . of a particular . . . medical service . . .” [emphasis added].

The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) advocates for recognition that each unborn child is a member of the human family, and that each abortion stops a beating heart and ends the life of a developing human being. That viewpoint is shared by many women who once believed otherwise and submitted to abortions, and by many men who once believed otherwise and were complicit in abortion; such persons number among the most committed activists within our organization and other pro-life organizations. Yet it would be intolerable for an advocacy organization such as ours to be required to hire, or prohibited from firing, a person who makes a “decision” to engage in advocacy or any other activity that is directly antithetical to our core mission to lawfully advocate for the civil rights of the unborn.

Under the RHNDRA, using any “decision . . . related to” abortion to inform decisions about hiring, firing, or benefits (among other things) would expose our organization both to enforcement actions by the District government bureaucracy, and to private lawsuits (some of which would likely be engendered by “sting” operations by pro-abortion advocates).

Some have suggested that we would be protected from such results by a clause in the pre-existing D.C. Human Rights Act that makes narrow allowance for “giving preference to persons of the same religion or political persuasion” as a controlling “religious or political organization.” But NRLC is neither a political nor a religious organization as those terms are used in the law. NRLC is not “operated, supervised or controlled by” any religious institution or political party, as the law requires to claim the narrow exemption. Moreover, our staff is made up of persons who are personally affiliated with a wide variety of religious bodies,

or with none, and persons who belong to a variety of political parties, or to none.

Article I of the U.S. Constitution provides that Congress shall “exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever” with respect to the seat of government, the federal District. Therefore, the RHND Act has been enacted with legal authority delegated to the District Council by Congress; that local body has no other political authority whatever under the Constitution. It follows that members of Congress are responsible for, and accountable for, abuses of the legal authority that Congress has delegated to District officials. The RHND Act is just such an abuse of delegated power—it is a politically motivated attack on our organization and the other organizations that seek to vindicate the human rights of unborn children.

The roll call on H. J. Res. 43, the resolution of disapproval, will be accurately described in our scorecard and in reports to our national membership as a fair reading of where each Member of the House of Representatives stands regarding a blatantly political attack on the pro-life movement.

Respectfully,

DOUGLAS D. JOHNSON,
Legislative Director.
SUSAN T. MUSKETT, J.D.,
Senior Legislative
Counsel.

Hon. PHIL MENDELSON,
Council of the District of Columbia,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MENDELSON: We represent the city's broad and diverse faith community. We may believe and practice our faith differently. We may have divergent positions on important issues. However we all agree that faith communities have a right to freely exercise their religion and a responsibility to promote and protect this important freedom. We believe religious freedom is not only our priority, but also a priority in our society.

We come together then to oppose the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014. We believe it would infringe upon religious employers' freedom to make employment decisions when necessary to preserve their religious mission and identity. In doing so, the legislation would allow for unjust and unnecessary government interference into religious employers' governance and operations.

While religious employers do not police employees' or dependents' private reproductive health decisions, these employers must have the freedom to respond to employees' public behavior repudiating their religious mission and identity.

We believe that the legislation would in fact discriminate against religious employers in a manner prohibited by the significant constitutional and legal protections provided to religious organizations in the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

We respectfully request that you oppose the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. We pray that you will be fair and reasonable in your considerations of our sincere concerns. We will follow up with you with regard to these priority concerns.

Sincerely,

Reverend Patrick Walker, President, Baptist Convention of D.C. and Vicinity; Reverend Susan Taylor, National Public Affairs Director, Church of Scientology National Affairs Office; Talib M. Shareef, CMSgt, USAF-Retired, Imam/President, The Nation's Mosque, Masjid Muhammad; Reverend Kendrick E. Curry, Pastor, Pennsylvania Avenue Baptist Church—DuPont Park; Reverend Dr. George C. Gilbert, Pastor, Holy Trinity United Baptist Church—Hillbrook; Reverend A.C. Durant, Pastor, Tenth Street

Baptist Church—Shaw; Reverend Sylvia Stanard, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Lee Holzinger, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Monsignor Robert Panke, Rector, Saint John Paul II Seminary—Brookland; Reverend William Byrne, Secretary of Pastoral Ministry and Social Concerns, Archdiocese of Washington.

Michael Scott, Director, D.C. Catholic Conference; Reverend Frederick Close, Pastor, St. Anthony Catholic Church—Brookland; Reverend Adam Y. Park, Pastor, Epiphany Catholic Church—Georgetown; Reverend Michael Briese, Pastor, Holy Name Catholic Church—Capitol Hill North; Reverend Monsignor Godfrey T. Mosley, Pastor, St. Ann Catholic Church—Tenleytown; Reverend Mark R. Ivany, Pastor, Assumption Catholic Church—Congress Heights; Reverend Michael J. Kelley, Pastor, St. Martin Catholic Church—Bloomington; Monsignor Raymond G. East, Pastor, St. Teresa of Avila Catholic Church—Anacostia; Reverend William Gurnee, Director of Spiritual Formation, Saint John Paul II Seminary—Brookland.

Monsignor John Enzler, President and CEO, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Henry A. Gaston, Pastor, Johnson Memorial Baptist Church; Reverend Beth Akiyama, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Kay Holzinger, Minister, Church of Scientology; Reverend Mario E. Dorsonville, Vice President of Mission and Immigration Outreach, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Avelino A. Gonzalez, Director, Ecumenical and Inter-Faith Affairs Archdiocese of Washington; Reverend Monsignor Ronald W. Jameson, Rector, Cathedral of Saint Matthew the Apostle—DuPont Circle; Reverend Monsignor James D. Watkins, Pastor, Immaculate Conception Catholic Church—Shaw; Reverend Monsignor Paul Langsfeld, Pastor, St. Joseph's Catholic Church on Capitol Hill.

Reverend Gregory Schommer, O.P., Pastor, St. Dominic Catholic Church—Southwest Waterfront; Reverend Andrew F. Royals; Reverend Mark R. Ivany, Pastor, St. Benedict the Moor Catholic Church—Kingman Park; Reverend Ron Potts, Pastor, Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament—Chevy Chase; Reverend Thomas Franks, S.S.J., Pastor, Our Lady of Perpetual Help Catholic Church—Buena Vista; Reverend Cornelius Kelechi Ejigogu, S.S.J., Pastor, St. Luke Catholic Church—Marshall Heights; Reverend Alfred J. Harris, Pastor, St. Mary Mother of God Catholic Church—Chinatown; Reverend Evelio Menjivar, Pastor, Our Lady Queen of the Americas—Kalamazoo; Reverend Richard Mullins, Pastor, St. Thomas Apostle Catholic Church—Woodley Park; Reverend Raymond M. Moore, Pastor, St. Thomas More Catholic Church—Washington Highlands; Monsignor Charles Pope, Pastor, Holy Comforter-Saint Cyprian Catholic Church—Capitol Hill.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, a pro-life organization can hire or fire anyone it wants to. If that person opposes the mission of the pro-life organization, the pro-life organization does not have to hire that person and may fire that person.

Another matter that has to be corrected is that the D.C. discrimination law provides that nothing in the act—the act under discussion here—prohibits religious and political organizations from limiting employment or admission to or giving preference to per-

sons of the same religion or political persuasion as calculated by that organization to promote the religious or political principles for which it is established or maintained.

That is the text.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), my friend.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlewoman from D.C.

Madam Speaker, I stand today in opposition to this resolution.

I want to make clear the consequences of the misguided resolution that we are considering today because it is not about religious freedom; it is about the freedom to make incredibly personal and significant decisions without having to consult your boss.

I have recently experienced the joy of becoming a mother for the first time. This miracle was not possible without the aid of in vitro fertilization. Given the excess radiation exposure I received during treatment for my combat-related amputations, this was the only way I would ever have a child.

Every woman in this country should have the same opportunity to start a family, and no woman should ever be fired for doing so. This should be common sense. Unfortunately, the resolution before us today would remove the legal protections ensuring that this is the case in D.C.

The law we are voting to disapprove today would prevent stories like that of Emily Herx's, a language arts teacher at a Catholic school in Indiana. She was fired after school authorities discovered that she and her husband used in vitro fertilization to try to have a child. They sought IVF treatments after learning that she suffered from a medical condition that caused infertility. She was told that the procedure was contrary to church teachings, and, as a result, her teaching contract would not be renewed. Last December, a jury sided with her, awarding her damages in the case.

Employees like Emily Herx should be judged at work based on their job performances, not on private decisions they make with their families and doctors. That is exactly what the D.C. Council intended to ensure in passing their resolution to protect women in the District.

I urge all Members to oppose this attempt by the majority to limit the rights of the people of the District of Columbia. In this day and age, the last thing we should be doing is punishing couples who are having difficulty in starting a family.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE), one of our freshmen and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 43, to protect different organizations from having to choose between their faiths and their jobs.

This is not a war on women. It is an outright war on religious liberties.

Forcing people to participate in offensive acts in order to stay in business is unconstitutional, and the D.C. Council has wholeheartedly interfered with the rights that are guaranteed in our Constitution. It is not a crime for individuals or organizations to exercise their First Amendment right. Respecting religious liberties when it can be reasonably accommodated is both common sense and constitutional.

As Congress, we have a duty to disapprove of what the D.C. Council has done, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 11 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a member of our committee.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, we have an obligation to fight discrimination wherever it exists and in whatever form it exists.

This resolution would allow employers to discriminate against employees who make decisions based on the interests of their health and their families. If employers don't like the personal health care decisions that their employees make, this resolution would allow employers to fire them.

Is it right to allow employers to fire women who use contraception or who try to conceive through in vitro fertilization?

Employees should be judged on their job performances and nothing else, especially not on their private medical decisions. Nobody has the right to interfere with those decisions—nobody—not an employer, not the House of Representatives, not any of us.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I first want to start by thanking my ranking member, Mr. ELIJAH CUMMINGS. I feel for him and for his city and what they are having to go through in Baltimore. I know he would have liked to have been here, but I have the utmost respect for him, and I wish nothing but the best for the people of Baltimore. I thank him for the decorum we have had and for the success we have had thus far on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. We have had good debates. We have disagreed on issues, but I think we have probably agreed on most issues that we have had come before us.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from the District, who cares passionately about her service and the people of Washington, D.C., and I know it comes from her heart as she speaks

about these. We have had good success on our committee in having these vigorous debates but having done so in a professional manner, and I thank her for that kind of discussion that we have had. Again, I know that she speaks from her heart on this.

Madam Speaker, we do believe that this was a timely and appropriate bill to bring up. I know that it doesn't happen very often. It is not a common occurrence. That is because a lot of what Washington, D.C., does and passes is not something that is of any controversy whatsoever. Yet, when you have the attorney general for the District of Columbia saying this has problems with the Constitution and problems in the law and when you have Mayor Gray making the same case that this has problems, I hope that both sides will recognize, no matter how they vote, that this law that was transmitted to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee—to Congress—is problematic, and they have admitted as such. They know that it is problematic, and I think we have a role and a responsibility to add our voice to that. That is what the Constitution calls for.

The Constitution makes it clear that Congress does have the ability to exercise the ultimate legislative authority over the District of Columbia. In the typical case, Congress plays no part in it as the overwhelming majority of pieces of legislation that get transmitted to us continue to sail on, but the RHNDAs legislation, as passed by the D.C. Council, has left us with no choice but to act.

The bill affects the hiring practices of all D.C. employers, but it provides no exemption for religious or political organizations that work to advance certain beliefs regarding reproductive health. Because of this, the bill fails to ensure that protections are guaranteed under the First Amendment.

As I said before, former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray, a Democrat, wrote the D.C. Council twice, warning that this bill was unconstitutional. To fix the problem, Mayor Gray recommended the council include an exemption for religious or political organizations, but the council and the current mayor ignored Mayor Gray's request, which would have alleviated the constitutional concerns. She ignored that. The current mayor ignored that. If they had taken Mayor Gray's advice, I don't think we would be standing here today, talking about this bill.

Washington, D.C.'s current mayor, Ms. Bowser, also saw the problems with the bill. She requested the council pass temporary—and that is important, “temporary”—emergency legislation clarifying the bill doesn't require an employer to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions that an employer does not agree with. That is an important part of this discussion, but the legislation is only temporary. The bill remains unclear as to what it requires the D.C. employers to cover.

The other point that I would put in place here is that Washington, D.C., has been a city for a long time—for a couple hundred years, I think—and this legislation has not been in place. We are not trying to erase something. We are saying that the bill that was transmitted to us is problematic, and there are ways to remedy and fix that. Some would say, well, it has been fixed by this temporary—again, temporary—piece of legislation, but that hasn't been transmitted to us. The D.C. Council had an opportunity to provide us with that temporary legislation, but they didn't. Maybe they will in the future—I don't know—but that is not the bill that is before us today.

What I am arguing for is the same thing in concept as from the Washington, D.C., attorney general. It is the same thing in concept that D.C. Mayor Gray has said, and it is the same thing, quite frankly, that the current mayor has argued is problematic, because she wanted to clarify that the very arguments we hear back to us are that their bill doesn't actually do that, that we are not trying to effect that—in essence, saying that we are right, that we are not trying to get into this dangerous, unprecedented territory which a lot of us find offensive.

Madam Speaker, I think what we have done is very reasonable in our approach. We have very differing approaches and mindsets. I get that, but I do appreciate the debate. That is what we are supposed to be doing in Congress.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and, certainly, our ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS. He is a good man, and he is in a tough situation. Again, our thoughts and prayers are with him and with the people of Baltimore and of Maryland. I would hope they would look to his leadership and what he is telling the people, which is to calmly, calmly discuss these issues as we are calmly discussing these issues here tonight.

Again, I urge the passage of this. I think it is an appropriate thing to do, and it is a timely thing to do. The clock has run out. We only have 30 days. The time is right upon us, so I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution tonight.

□ 2215

Finally, I will say I really do appreciate Mrs. BLACK for her heart and passion on this issue and the good work that she has done. She cares deeply about these issues. We all do.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and say that I do want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. CHAFFETZ, for the way he has run the committee and especially with respect to this controversial legislation. He has allowed members to speak. It has been a very civil repartee on both sides.

I would like to offer that I have already read the text of D.C. law that exempts both religious and political organizations from limiting employment

in the way that other employers must, that they may hire based on their religious views and their political views. Pro-life organizations are protected; churches are protected.

The continuous citation of the former Mayor and the former attorney general would make you think that they were still in office. The council did, in fact, look once again at their objections, finding that their objections had already been taken care of in prior D.C. law. The council then unanimously passed the bill again.

It is painful to hear the insurance matter cited against the District of Columbia because the only reason it isn't final law is because the District of Columbia has to transmit to this body every law, and it has to lay over for at least 30 days before it becomes final. If we had our way, if we had the same rights that every other Member has whose district is in the United States of America, it would already be law. It shouldn't be cited against us.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a member of the committee.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I address you today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 43. The resolution undermines the purpose of the D.C. Council antidiscrimination bill. D.C. residents deserve to be protected from discrimination in the workplace. Everyone should have the ability to make a private healthcare decision, including when and how they will start a family, and without the fear of losing their jobs or facing retaliation or retribution from their employer.

Unfortunately, women across the country have faced discrimination for personal decisions such as using birth control, becoming pregnant while unmarried, or using in vitro fertilization to become pregnant. Contrary to claims by my Republican colleagues, this bill does not impose any new requirements on employers to cover or to pay for any reproductive health services.

Are women's rights not guaranteed by the Constitution just like those of men in this country? This is not about whether you or I have an abortion or whether you or I use IVF. Madam Speaker, this is about a woman's right to choose what is right for them in the privacy of their homes and doctor's office and with their family. This is not about pro-choice or pro-life. This is about religious freedom. This is about government intrusion.

This resolution, forced on the people of D.C. by a Member of Congress from Tennessee, flies in the face of the democratic debate and vote already heard by the D.C. Council. This resolution preserves the current exemption in the D.C. human rights laws for religious organizations and does not impose any additional requirements on employers based on their religious belief.

I stand here today, Madam Speaker, as a member of the largest number of

women in this Congress, and I can tell you, I am offended by this bill. I stand here today in opposition.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), a cosponsor of the bill and one of my colleagues from my State.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her work on this issue, and I also thank Chairman CHAFFETZ for the work that he has done on this issue.

Both the gentlewoman and the chairman have mentioned the work and the comments by Mayor Gray regarding this policy and the policy by the RHNDAA. You can say the reason that we are here tonight is to correct a wrong. I think you could also say that it is here to protect one of those first principles that we hold so very dear in this country and one of the reasons that our country was founded: to celebrate and enjoy religious freedom. So that is what brings us to the floor tonight. One of the things that we hear from our constituents all the time, Madam Speaker, is that we should never pass bills that are going to compromise or limit our freedoms.

Now, it is important to note that what the District has done with the RHNDAA would prevent organizations of faith—including schools, churches, and pro-life groups established explicitly to uphold their moral and ethical views—from making personnel decisions consistent with the mission of their very establishment. So that is a prohibition that we are addressing with this resolution that we are bringing forward tonight.

I think it is important to note the resolution doesn't take away any rights and it doesn't add any new rights. What it does is to maintain what has been current law. That is something that is important for us to remember. I also think it is important to note that in 2012 the Supreme Court unanimously affirmed the rights of religious organizations, and we stand tonight with that affirmation.

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I insert for the RECORD two letters, one from Americans United for Separation of Church and State, and the other from over 20 organizations, including the Anti-Defamation League, Catholics for Choice, People for the American Way, United Methodist Church General Board of Church and Society, over 20 organizations. Both letters are in opposition to the resolution.

AMERICANS UNITED, APRIL 30, 2015.
Re: Oppose Attempts to Curtail Civil Rights in the District of Columbia

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Americans United for Separation of Church and State, we write to urge you to oppose efforts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H.J. Res. 43, the resolution to disapprove of D.C.'s Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014

(RHNDAA). This bill, which the D.C. Council recently passed unanimously, expands civil rights and effectuates the will of the people of D.C. It should not be nullified by Congress.

Founded in 1947, Americans United is a nonpartisan educational organization dedicated to preserving the constitutional principle of church-state separation as the only way to ensure true religious freedom for all Americans. We fight to protect the right of individuals and religious communities to worship—or not—as they see fit without government interference, compulsion, support, or disparagement. Americans United has more than 120,000 members and supporters across the country.

THE REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH NON-DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT

The RHNDAA protects D.C. employees and their dependents from discrimination based on their personal reproductive health care decisions. This bill strengthens existing protections against employment discrimination and ensures that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, including whether, when, and how to start a family and what the size of their family should be, without fear of losing their jobs or facing retribution from their employers.

Our nation's laws have long protected the freedom of religion and belief, ensuring every person has the right to follow the dictates of his or her own conscience. Contrary to opponents' claims, the RHNDAA does not violate religious freedom protections.

In accordance with the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, religious beliefs do not excuse compliance with valid and neutral laws of general applicability. Courts deem laws neutral unless they "target religious beliefs" or "if the object of [the] law is to infringe upon or restrict practices because of their religious motivation." The RHNDAA does not single out religious beliefs or practices. Instead, the bill treats all employers the same.

The RHNDAA would also survive a challenge under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which applies to D.C. RFRA prohibits the government from "substantially burden[ing] a person's exercise of religion" unless the government can demonstrate that the burden is justified by a compelling government interest and is the least restrictive means of furthering that interest. RFRA is not triggered when there is just "the slightest obstacle to religious exercise." And, burdens are permissible when the government's interest is important, including combatting discrimination.

The bill does not compel any employer to endorse any actions that may be in conflict with their religious tenets. This act merely ensures that employees and their families face no employment consequences for their private health care decisions. Eradicating employment discrimination against women is a compelling government interest and there is no less restrictive means of preventing discrimination.

Furthermore, this bill protects women who choose to exercise their constitutionally protected rights to make "personal choice[s] in matters of marriage and family life." Business owners are absolutely entitled to their religious beliefs—but they cannot use their beliefs to justify discrimination against their employees. The RHNDAA would make sure that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, based on their own consciences and in consultation with their own physicians, without fear of losing their job.

Finally, it's important to remember that the RHNDAA does not override existing protections for religious employers in hiring.

The D.C. Human Rights Act already contains an exemption for employers “operated, supervised, or controlled by or in connection with a religious . . . organization” to give preference or limit employment to those of the same faith. Moreover, as the Supreme Court held in *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & Sch. v. E.E.O.C.*, the First Amendment protects religious institutions’ right to make decisions about employees in ministerial positions—those who preach and teach the faith. The RHNDAA does not alter these already-existing protections.

THE HUMAN RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT

Although the House will be voting on H.J. Res. 43, which would prevent the RHNDAA from taking effect, H.J. Res. 44, a resolution of disapproval of D.C.’s Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014 (HRAA), has also been introduced. This is another attempt to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia and should likewise be rejected.

The HRAA would ensure that LGBT students in the District are not subject to discrimination by educational institutions. Under the HRAA, religiously affiliated educational institutions would have to provide LGBT student groups with the same equal access to school facilities and services as all other student groups, but they would not be required to provide LGBT student groups with funds or official recognition.

The HRAA, like the RHNDAA, has also been attacked by opponents claiming it violates religious freedom protections under the First Amendment and RFRA. But religiously affiliated educational institutions have neither a constitutional nor statutory right to discriminate against LGBT student groups in the name of religion. The HRAA is a neutral law of general applicability that has the effect of ensuring all schools and universities provide equal access and services to LGBT students. It would not compel the schools to fund or recognize LGBT student groups and serves a government interest that the D.C. Court of Appeals long ago held was compelling. As explained by the Court, eradicating discrimination against LGBT students serves to “foster[] individual dignity, . . . creat[e] a climate and environment in which each individual can utilize his or her potential to contribute to and benefit from society, and [promote the] equal protection of the life, liberty and property that the Founding Fathers guaranteed to us all.”

CONCLUSION

The D.C. Council, supported by the people it represents, passed the RHNDAA and the HRAA to protect members of the D.C. community from discrimination. Contrary to the rhetoric surrounding this bill, it does not violate religious liberty protections. Rather, the RHNDAA stands to protect all employees in the District from discrimination. Accordingly, we urge you to reject any attempts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H.J. Res. 43.

Religion should never be used as an excuse to justify discrimination. Yet that is what opponents of these measures would like to do. We know there will be other attempts to misuse religious liberty in Congress. We urge you to reject this one and those to come.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

MAGGIE GARRETT,
Legislative Director,
Americans United
for Separation of
Church and State

ELISE HELGESEN AGUILAR,
Federal Legislative
Counsel, Americans
United for Separation

*tion of Church and
State.*

APRIL 30, 2015.

Re: Oppose Attempts to Curtail D.C. Civil Rights

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned religious, interfaith, and civil liberties organizations that advocate for freedom of religion and belief write to urge you to reject any and all congressional efforts, including resolutions of disapproval, that would prevent two D.C. civil rights bills from taking effect. The D.C. Council unanimously passed both the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (RHNDAA) and the Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014 (HRAA) to support one basic underlying principle: fairness. The bills help ensure that others are treated fairly—as we all would like to be treated. These bills do not violate religious freedom, but instead protect freedom of conscience and ensure equal treatment for all students and employees.

We urge you to oppose H. J. Res. 43, which seeks to overturn the RHNDAA. The RHNDAA strengthens the District’s existing nondiscrimination protections so that employees in D.C. and their dependents do not face employment discrimination because of their personal reproductive health care decisions.

The RHNDAA would ensure that employees and their families can make their own private health decisions, based on their own consciences and in consultation with their own physicians, without fear of losing their job. Business owners are absolutely entitled to their personal religious beliefs—but they cannot use their beliefs to justify discrimination against their employees.

Similarly, we urge you to oppose H. J. Res. 44, which would repeal the HRAA. The HRAA ensures that all educational institutions in D.C. provide access to school facilities and services for all student clubs equally. Contrary to opponents’ claims, the HRAA does not require religiously affiliated schools to provide LGBT student groups with funding or official recognition. The HRAA simply upholds students’ freedom of conscience by repealing a congressionally imposed exemption to D.C. law that allows religiously affiliated educational institutions to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

Despite opponents’ claims, neither bill violates the religious freedom protections found in the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment or the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA). The two bills are neutral and generally applicable because they have the effect of applying nondiscrimination protections to all employers and all educational institutions in the District; neither single out a faith group or religious practice. Moreover, neither bill requires a religious organization to endorse any action that conflicts with its religious teachings. Finally, each bill furthers the government’s compelling interest in eradicating discrimination in the District.

Religious freedom is a fundamental American value. It guarantees us the freedom to hold any belief we choose without government interference. It cannot, however, be used to trump others’ civil rights, and it should not justify striking down laws that ensure people are treated fairly. We should strive to expand civil rights protections, not curtail them.

We urge you to oppose any attempts to curtail civil rights in the District of Columbia, including H. J. Res. 43 and H. J. Res. 44.

Sincerely,

Americans United for Separation of
Church and State, Anti-Defamation
League, Catholics for Choice, Center

for Inquiry, Disciples for Choice, Disciples Justice Action Network, Equal Justice Task Force of African American Ministers in Action, Equal Partners in Faith, Hindu American Foundation, Institute for Science and Human Values, Inc., Interfaith Alliance, Methodist Federation for Social Action, Metropolitan Community Churches, National Council of Jewish Women, People For the American Way, Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, Secular Coalition for America, Sikh American Legal Defense and Education Fund (SALDEF), Union for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries, United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society, Unitarian Universalist Association.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a member of the committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this extreme and misguided resolution.

I am deeply troubled that this Chamber continues to waste its time attacking women’s health rather than crafting solutions for the American people. Instead of addressing the real challenges facing our Nation, this resolution is yet another attempt by House leaders to inject ideology into women’s personal medical decisions. A woman’s healthcare choices should be made between her and her doctor, not by her boss.

By overturning D.C.’s new anti-discrimination protections, this resolution would give employers the right to fire workers based on the decisions they make about their birth control. This is simply unacceptable. All Americans should be free to make medical decisions without the fear of being fired or demoted.

Now is the time for House leaders to stop undermining women’s reproductive rights and focus on the actual needs of working families. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, let me repeat the opinion of former D.C. Mayor Vincent Gray and his attorney general. They believe that this law we are considering tonight is legally problematic and raises serious concerns under the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, many organizations in the District have asked Congress for help, including Cardinal Wuerl of the Catholic Diocese. I include for the RECORD the April 17, 2015, letter to the editor of The Washington Post from Cardinal Wuerl and President Garvey from Catholic University.

[From the Washington Post, April 17, 2015]

DISAGREEMENT IS NOT DISCRIMINATION

(By Donald Wuerl and John Garvey)

Cardinal Donald Wuerl is the archbishop of Washington. John Garvey is the president of Catholic University of America.

Last month, Pope Francis announced that the Catholic Church would celebrate a Holy Year of Divine Mercy. God’s mercy has been a theme of his pontificate.

We all need God's forgiveness. The pope has said, "I am a sinner." The Catholic Church's response to our human frailty is not condemnation but mercy. There may be no institution that understands this better.

Recent laws enacted by the D.C. Council would have us believe otherwise. The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act and the Human Rights Amendment Act purport to address "discrimination" by institutions such as ours, the Archdiocese of Washington and the Catholic University of America. The putative victims of this discrimination are people who part ways with church teaching about unborn life and sexual autonomy.

Consider the reproductive health law, which the council says is designed to prevent discrimination against employees who have abortions, have sex outside marriage or seek sterilization or other means to prevent pregnancy. Given the effort expended and ink spilled on this purported civil rights measure, you would think the church was hunting out sexual offenders and fining or firing them. But the church understands that we are all sinners, all equally deserving of punishment (if it comes to that) and all equally in need of God's mercy. We are not in the business of privileging some sinners over others.

The church's message, though, is one of mercy, not moral indifference. That is why we object to these two laws. They ask for much more than mercy and understanding. Consider again the reproductive health law. It forbids an employer to "discriminate against an individual" on the basis of her "reproductive health decision making." Suppose your job is pro-life education in the archdiocese's Department of Life Issues. We can imagine a woman who had an abortion working effectively in that office. (Dorothy Day, founder of the Catholic Worker movement and a great witness to life, had an abortion when she was 21.) But suppose you continue to believe that abortion was the right choice for you to make and honesty compels you to share that opinion with other women in your circumstances. A law forbidding discrimination on the basis of "reproductive health decision making" would seem to prevent the church from challenging or dismissing such an employee, even though she is working at odds with the mission of the office that hired her.

We have similar concerns about the Human Rights Amendment law. It says that religious institutions are guilty of discrimination against gay and lesbian student groups if, in the words of the committee report, they deny them the same "rights and facilities as other officially recognized student groups." The Catholic Church's views about sexual autonomy, like its views about reproductive health, are more traditional than those held by the D.C. Council. But it seems peculiar to say that the church discriminates, in some morally objectionable way, by declining to give official support to groups that hold views opposed to its own.

Mercy is not the same as moral relativism. Disagreement is not the same as discrimination. The law goes too far when it demands that the church abandon its beliefs in the pursuit of an entirely novel state of equality.

The D.C. Council has failed to appreciate this point. Reluctantly, we turned to Congress for a resolution of disapproval. This procedure is in keeping with the American tradition of political appeal against political decisions. If that course of action fails, we have no doubt we will eventually prevail in court. The respect for religious freedom that we ask for is enshrined in the Constitution. But we hope that our elected officials can also see that it's a matter of common sense.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, our history has a long history of tolerance

toward religious institutions. Indeed, one of the words inscribed on the rostrum here in the center of it is "tolerance." We need to approve this resolution to be tolerant of our religious institutions. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. May I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 5 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her outstanding service and leadership on behalf of the District of Columbia and the people of the District of Columbia. As well, let me acknowledge the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for his kind words of deliberation, and certainly the ranking member for his leadership, Mr. CUMMINGS, who, as we all know, is addressing some of the very heavy concerns in his own city.

Let me give all the facts, Madam Speaker. I happen to believe in statehood for the District of Columbia. I think that is important to state on the record. But I realize that the Constitution has a framework for the Congress to address the issues of the laws here in the District of Columbia. I realize, as well, that home rule has been given under that authority, and this Congress, in the right thinking, has allowed basically for the District of Columbia to rule its city on the basis of good governance of the citizens of this particular community. That is the right thing to do. They are taxpaying Americans.

So I am disturbed by H.J. Res. 43 because it seeks to cause confusion where there is no need for confusion. Let me first start by saying that the Ninth Amendment gives a right to privacy to all Americans, and Washingtonians are Americans. The right to privacy has indicated, through the Supreme Court, that *Roe v. Wade*, the right to choose, is the law.

Yes, the First Amendment gives the freedom of religion, but our gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has indicated that the District of Columbia clarified that this law does not violate and will not force someone to go against their political views or their religious views.

Why are we here tonight when this resolution that the District of Columbia passed simply prohibits employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions, protects the reproductive health decisions of the spouses and dependents, and prohibits an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady.

So, in essence, Madam Speaker, this resolution is not in order.

If I might make another analogy, what is not given to the Federal Government is left to the States in the Tenth Amendment. I know that D.C. is not a State, but what I would say is that this law has been clarified in the District of Columbia. We are intruding. The rights are protected under the Ninth Amendment, and this resolution is out of order. I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition of H.J. Res. 43 disapproving the District of Columbia government's approval of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act also known as RHNDA.

As I have before, I maintain that the right of a woman to privacy must remain sacrosanct because the well being and protection of women is the nucleus of a healthy America and a healthy world.

Indeed, in most parts of our country, the woman is the constant that keeps all the variables of family together, organized and on track.

Thus, for three key reasons I oppose H.J. Res. 43.

First, it is in derogation of DC's local autonomy, an autonomy that we enjoy in our respective states, pursuant to the Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

In relevant part, the Tenth Amendment states that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I find it ironic, as duly elected officials that some of us seek to trample upon the rights that we enjoy vis a vis the separation of the federal and state powers, as delineated in our Constitution.

To add insult to injury, some of us are even able to look the congressional representative from Washington, DC in the eye, while we take adverse decisions that affect the livelihood of her constituents.

Second, the District of Columbia government's action does good without infringing on the First Amendment and religious freedoms of American citizens.

Third, this recent iteration of the war on the rights of women underscores our misplaced priorities where we have numerous pressing issues.

Among others, we continue to have unemployment, national security concerns with the continued proliferation of terrorist organizations across the globe.

We continue to grapple with how we need to work in a bipartisan manner on the issues of education, healthcare and infrastructure building to protect children, our elderly, veterans and other groups.

Our focus ought to be on bettering the quality of life for everyday American people.

Let us zoom in on one of what should be our major priority areas: jobs.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that over 8 million Americans are unemployed.

Specifically, among the major worker groups affected by the current unemployment rates

are adult men who account for 5.1 percent, adult women who account for 4.9 percent and teenagers who account for 17.5 percent.

Whites make up 4.7 percent, African Americans 10.1 percent, Asians 3.2 percent and Hispanics make up 6.8 percent.

Should we really be focusing our attention on a measure that blocks the District of Columbia's effort to make laws that protects the privacy rights of women and their spouses when we have more pressing priorities?

But back to H.J. Res. 43.

What does this legislation do to undermine DC's autonomy, attack women's rights and waste precious tax payer resources?

H.J. Res. 43 seeks to undermine an underlying Bill: the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act considered, voted upon by the duly elected officials of the District of Columbia and signed into law by Mayor Muriel Bowser of Washington, DC in January of this year.

The underlying bill signed into law in Washington, DC would do the following:

Prohibit employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions.

Protect the reproductive health decisions of spouses and dependents.

Prohibit an employer from firing an employee for using in vitro fertilization or birth control.

Contrary to assertions by my colleagues across the aisle, let us look at what RHND A does not do:

First, it does not impose any new requirements on employers to provide health insurance coverage;

In fact, the D.C. Council considered this issue and clarified that RHND A's protections do not reach insurance coverage by passing a temporary clarification;

Second, the RHND A does not infringe on First Amendment rights;

Indeed, the RHND A does not impact an organization or church's ability to make hiring decisions based on religious or political views.

Opponents may claim that the bill might require churches or religious organizations to hire pro-choice candidates.

This can hold no water because it is simply not within the scope of RHND A.

The RHND A strikes the balance of protecting personal decisions a woman makes regarding her reproductive health while not overreaching related to personal religious beliefs as it relates to a woman's reproductive health.

In my view, H.J. Res. 43 is another jab at the voice of women, their rights to self-determination and reproductive freedoms articulated in our nation's highest court's ruling in *Griswold v. Connecticut* and *Roe v. Wade*.

My friends, this week, 100 years ago, over 1000 women activists congregated at the Hague to ask for peace, protesting World War I and asserted their right to self-determination.

Dr. Aletta Jacobs, Jane Addams and sociologist Emily G. Balch were some of the champions of women's rights a century ago at the Hague.

Similar to their counterparts a century ago, today, in our era, we are blessed with women who are champions of a woman's right to self-determination and privacy.

Wendy Davis, Sandra Fluke and Lilly Ledbetter, just to name a few.

Notwithstanding the sacrifices made by all these women of courage, women and girls continue to be at the mercy of people who fail

to try to show empathy towards their mothers, their sisters, their daughters, and loved ones.

Take for example the case of Emily Herx, a married woman who was terminated for using in vitro to become pregnant.

With her husband by her side, fortunately she was awarded a \$1.9 million judgment against her employer.

Then there's the case of Jennifer Maudlin, a single unmarried mother working to support her children, who worked for an employer hostile towards unmarried women who became pregnant.

Maudlin was terminated as well, but was able to enter a settlement with her employer after she fought her illegal termination.

Then there is the case of Apryl Kellam, who was threatened with termination for being a single mother.

And the stories go on and on.

Clearly, as these real life stories reflect, H.J. Res. 43 affects all: significant others, spouses and daughters.

If passed, Republicans seek to empower employers to fire a woman because she has an abortion after experiencing the violent act of rape.

That is immoral.

Republicans seek to empower employers to demote a woman or pay her less if she chooses to take birth control pills.

That is unfair.

Indeed, Republicans seek to empower employers to fire a male worker because he uses condoms and because his wife uses birth control pills.

That makes no sense.

Republicans seek to empower employers to terminate a male employee because his teenage daughter becomes pregnant out of wedlock.

That is irrational.

In other words, Madam Speaker, H.J. Res. 43 is immoral, unfair and irrational.

It is also in derogation of women's privacy rights, violative of family rights and economic empowerment-issues affecting the livelihood of millions of families across our nation.

Thus, I stand in solidarity with my colleagues in opposing this Bill.

I also stand in solidarity with the Administration which has urged Congress in this Statement of Administration Policy to adopt the President's FY 2016 Budget proposal allowing the District to enact local laws and spend local funds in the same way as other cities and States.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose H.J. Res. 43.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), who is a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today and want to reach out to my colleague, the Delegate from D.C. to, one, say that I appreciate the tone and tenor of this debate. I have great respect for her and, actually, during this debate have grown to admire her even more.

I would like to point out, however, that much of what has been talked about tonight about there being clarity is simply not the case, Madam Speaker.

□ 2230

We do know that, if we just broaden the ministerial exception, where we can look for items of conscience and make sure that those fundamental rights are protected, Madam Speaker, that this particular legislation would indeed do exactly what the Delegate from D.C. has said that it would do.

I stand here tonight to offer, again, my willingness to work with not only the Delegate from D.C., but the Mayor and the city council, to hopefully provide that clarifying language.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

May I say how much I appreciate that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MEADOWS, made every effort to try to find some accommodation with the District of Columbia. I certainly appreciated that so much.

We were, unfortunately, unable to do so because the exemption he sought would have swallowed the equal employment laws. There would have been nothing left to them, but he tried very hard, and I appreciate the spirit in which he has acted as our subcommittee chair.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 43.

This resolution would express Congress' disapproval of the District of Columbia's legislation that would protect employees from discrimination based on their reproductive health decisions.

Just last month, the States of Indiana and Arkansas attempted to pass so-called "religious freedom" bills that are really an attempt to permit discrimination.

Tonight, we are debating a resolution that would allow employers to fire or refuse to hire workers because of their private reproductive medical decisions, notwithstanding the protection provided to the employees by the District of Columbia.

Madam Speaker, in 1993, when Congress passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, better known as RFRA, it did so with the intent to expand protections for religious exercise; but since then, we have seen attempts by Congress and some States to use so-called "religious liberty" or "religious freedom" measures to undermine otherwise valid protections against discrimination provided in the Civil Rights Act.

This resolution would allow claims of a "sincerely held religious belief" to justify otherwise illegal discrimination. The reasoning in this resolution would also undermine all civil rights laws because anyone could claim a sincerely held religious belief to justify discrimination based on anything—race, religion, or any other protected class.

The District of Columbia got it right. This law protects Washington, D.C.,

citizens from invidious discrimination based on reproductive health decisions. We should not overrule this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.J. Res. 43.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, which will stop the so-called Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This bill, passed by the D.C. City Council, discriminates against religious and pro-life advocacy groups in the District of Columbia.

The D.C. government forces employers to provide abortion coverage for their employees. This law represents a flagrant disregard for the conscience rights of all D.C. employers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my fellow Members of the House to vote “yes” on this important resolution of disapproval.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 43, to disapprove the action of the D.C. Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, which I believe clearly violates the constitutional freedoms of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

This is not just about the citizens of one city. It is about protecting the freedoms and liberties enshrined in our Constitution for all Americans. This is about making sure the government does not force employers with deeply held religious beliefs and values to act against their conscience.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.J. Res. 43.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTEMBER).

Mr. PITTEMBER. I thank Mrs. BLACK for her leadership.

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

Madam Speaker, will we dare vote tonight to uphold the free exercise of religion? Will we dare vote tonight to ensure that no church or religious institution in the District of Columbia is forced to violate their beliefs and convictions?

Yes, we have a solemn obligation to support our constitutional commitment to religious liberty, so I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.J. Res. 43, the disapproval resolution to block the D.C. Council’s disregard of fundamental constitutional rights.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, the question tonight is clearly the evisceration of the U.S. Constitution by the District of Columbia.

Don’t take my word for it. Even the former Mayor of D.C., who agrees ideologically with the D.C. Council, warned his colleagues that the D.C. bill was “legally insufficient,” “legally problematic,” and “raises concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.”

RHND discriminates against mission-driven organizations located in the Nation’s Capital, impinging on the freedom of association and religion for advocacy groups, particularly religious and pro-life affiliates, our neighbors right here in the District of Columbia.

I ask we vote “yes.”

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. This resolution represents tyranny on two levels: the tyranny the Framers most feared, by the Federal Government interfering with local government; and the tyranny Americans especially fear today, interference with the most private decision they make, the decision concerning their reproductive health.

Vote “no.” Stop this tyranny in the District of Columbia before it spreads throughout the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the robust debates that we have had here today on this important issue.

As I close, I would like to remind everyone, Madam Speaker, that this is legislation that has constitutional problems. We have said this over and over again since its inception, and the constitutional problems have been recognized by both the Democrats and the Republicans.

There has been a lot of conversation tonight about what this bill does and does not do. This resolution is about allowing religious and political organizations to hire employees who agree with their core mission as protected by the First Amendment.

It is imperative that this body adopt this resolution of disapproval to ensure the protections granted to each and

every American by the First Amendment of our Constitution.

As a matter of fact, folks tried to say what this resolution would do. It is a very simple resolution. It is a 1-page resolution. It has a few sentences to it, and I would like to just read those sentences. It is “disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.” That is simply what it does.

We have the constitutional authority to give an up-or-down vote. We are not amending. If this resolution of disapproval is adopted by this body, it simply will put back into place what is already law in the District of Columbia. It will not be taking away any rights.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution, which would disapprove of the D.C. Council’s passage of the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This resolution infringes on the reproductive rights of American citizens.

It allows employers to discriminate against employees based on their personal health decisions.

And it tramples on the rights of the people of the District of Columbia to govern themselves.

In January, the Mayor of the District of Columbia signed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

This Act was passed by the District’s elected representatives on the D.C. Council.

The Act prohibits employers from discriminating against employees based on their reproductive health decisions.

It also protects the reproductive health decisions of their spouses and their dependents.

By passing this resolution, congressional Republicans are impinging on the rights of women in the District of Columbia to make their own reproductive health decisions without fear that their bosses will punish them.

This resolution would permit an employer to fire a woman because she has an abortion after being raped.

It would allow an employer to demote a woman—or pay her less—if she chooses to take birth control pills.

This resolution would not affect only the rights of women.

It would allow an employer to fire a male worker because he uses condoms, because his wife uses the pill, or because his teenage daughter becomes pregnant out of wedlock.

As I told my colleagues in the Oversight Committee when we marked up this resolution, this is the same Committee that brought the world Sandra Fluke.

She wanted to come before the House Oversight Committee to testify about contraceptives on February 16, 2012.

But she was not allowed to speak. She was deemed “unqualified.”

Today, this is exactly what House Republicans are doing to the people of the District of Columbia.

They want a voice in their own governance. They expressed their will. And their elected officials passed a law protecting their rights.

But now, House Republicans are trying to silence the voters of the District of Columbia, just as they tried to silence Sandra Fluke.

This approach will backfire, just as it did with Sandra Fluke.

She gave a voice to millions of women across the country, and she was heard far and wide.

The simple fact is that, regardless of what House Republicans do here today, this resolution has no chance of becoming law.

We all know this is nothing more than a symbolic gesture. But it reveals very clearly what Republicans stand for.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, it is simply shocking that in this day and age employees are still being discriminated against because of their reproductive health choices, such as whether or not to use birth control, undergo in vitro fertilization to get pregnant, or for having sex without being married.

The Council of the District of Columbia recently passed a law protecting D.C. women and families from such discrimination, making it clear that they cannot be penalized or retaliated against because of the employee's personal reproductive health care choices. The District of Columbia Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act takes a stand and makes a statement that this sort of discrimination will not be tolerated in the District of Columbia.

The House Majority wants to overturn the D.C. Council's law. H.J. Res. 43 is not only a slap in the face of the women of D.C. but also to their families. It affects whether people can choose to wait to have children, have children at all, and when they can or cannot have sex. Frankly, it's none of our business. Is there anything more private than someone's child-bearing decisions? Than who to get intimate with? In a country that will spend \$166 million on the movie *50 Shades of Grey*, the Republican Majority thinks imposing their own Puritanical ideology and theology on District residents is acceptable?

House Republicans constantly argue for limiting the power of the federal government and to respect the rights of the state and local governments. However, once again, they feel it is necessary to usurp the decision that the D.C. government unanimously voted on for its own citizens. Do unto others but don't do unto me. That is about as hypocritical as you can get.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject H.J. Res. 43 and to support D.C.'s local government and the women of D.C. to make their own reproductive choices.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose the Republican Majority's unilateral, and rather extraordinary, effort to undermine democracy in the District of Columbia.

A majority that claims to oppose big government and fancies itself as the champion of

State and local rights; astonishingly finds itself on the precipice of wielding the Federal Government's power to overturn the decision of a local government solely because it can. Not because it should; but because it can.

Never mind that the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act was appropriately considered, passed, and enacted by the duly elected representatives of the District of Columbia. The majority has decided that democratic principles take a back seat to pleasing its anti-reproductive rights base.

Make no mistake; this disgraceful vote represents a strike against the right to self-governance. It is an affront to D.C. home rule and a regrettable regression by the majority to a previous era, when Republicans of the 1990's abused congressional power to advance intrusive, anti-democratic legislation that meddled in the District's local affairs. Indeed, this resolution is emblematic of efforts by certain segments of the conservative movement that intended or not, would actually have the effect of enshrining bigotry into our laws in the name of fighting it.

Let us have no illusions about what the majority seeks to do this evening. In making a mockery of the D.C. Home Rule Act, the majority is seeking to repeal a local government statute that prohibits discrimination on the basis of reproductive health decisions and protects its citizens against prejudice in the workplace.

This law has absolutely nothing to do with health insurance coverage. As the Chairman of the D.C. Council stated in a letter to Congress, “The purpose and intent of this bill is to prevent an employer, through our Human Rights Act, from firing an employee for that employee's personal decision regarding his or her reproductive health.”

In closing, it is true that the United States Constitution grants the Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the affairs of the District of Columbia. Yet, just because we can does not mean we should.

I implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who loudly proclaim to be the part of limited government, to recognize that Congress should always strive to treat the District of Columbia like any other State, and respect the rights of all Americans to exercise democratic self-governance.

I urge all my colleagues to strongly oppose this anti-democratic resolution.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 43 to overturn the D.C. Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act.

To be clear, this Resolution is not about protecting freedom of religion and beliefs. No, House Joint Resolution 43 is about allowing discrimination.

Despite misleading rhetoric, this Resolution would allow an employer to discriminate against an employee based on the employee's personal health care decisions—decisions which have nothing to do with the employer.

Everyone should have the ability to make private health decisions including whether, when, and how to start a family, without fear of losing their jobs or facing retribution from employers.

The D.C. Council understands this and, by passing the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act, seeks to ensure fair and necessary employment protections for the people of the District of Columbia.

The Council deserves our respect when protecting the rights of their constituents . . . the people who elected them. The oversight of this body should not extend to overturning legislation passed by democratically-elected representatives of the people of D.C.

The freedom of religion is a fundamental freedom established by our founding fathers that we should fiercely protect, but to suggest that it extends to employers imposing their beliefs on the people that work for them, as this Resolution does, is just plain WRONG, particularly when it comes to something as personal as reproductive health.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 43, Disapproving the Action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act. While this resolution is certainly an abuse of Congress' authority over the District of Columbia, it more importantly undermines the right of a woman to make personal, private healthcare decisions.

The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act of 2014 (RHNDNA) was passed by the D.C. Council in order to protect employees and their families from discrimination. RHNDNA ensures that an employee cannot be terminated based on personal reproductive healthcare decisions. For instance, the use of birth control, the decision of when to start a family, or the use of in vitro fertilization are not grounds for termination in the District of Columbia.

The RHNDNA does not impose any new requirements on employers to provide health insurance coverage or to pay for any reproductive or abortion services nor does it discriminate against pro-life organizations. The RHNDNA actually clarifies that every employee in D.C. is able to follow their own moral or religious beliefs, including when and how to start a family, without fear of facing consequences at work.

Religious liberty is of the utmost importance and the RHNDNA respects religious and moral decision-making without impacting anyone outside of the person making their own decisions. We must allow religious liberty to also mean allowing people to work in an environment that respects their dignity and private life and is free from discrimination.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.J. Res. 43 because it not only infringes upon the personal decision-making of an individual, it also blatantly disregards D.C.'s local laws.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 43, a joint resolution of Congress, which is needed to protect the conscience rights of pro-life employers that operate in the District of Columbia. Under DC's home rule law, Congress has a time period in which to review DC-passed legislation.

In January, DC Mayor Bowser signed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act (RHNDNA). This measure would, in part, ban employers from making personnel decisions based on an individual's decisions relating to abortion and other reproductive health issues.

RHNDNA would have the force of law and specifically discriminate against pro-life employers by potentially forcing them to hire and retain individuals who advocate for policies that run counter to the employer's mission.

Pro-life organizations, including those who exist to advance pro-life policies, should not be forced by the DC government to hire individuals who hold and advocate for positions

that run counter to the core values of that organization. Christian schools and pro-life organizations should not be required to cover “re-productive health decisions” in their health care plans that are counter to their core pro-life convictions.

This DC law amounts to coercion and should have no place in the nation’s capital, or any jurisdiction for that matter. This is a step too far and H.J. Res. 43 restores these fundamental conscience rights.

I rise in strong support of this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins (KS)
Aderholt	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Allen	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Amodei	Ellmers (NC)	Jones
Babin	Emmer (MN)	Jordan
Barletta	Farenthold	Joyce
Barr	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Barton	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Benishek	Fleischmann	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Fleming	Kinzinger (IL)
Bishop (MI)	Flores	Kline
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Knight
Black	Fortenberry	Labrador
Blackburn	Fox	LaMalfa
Blum	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Bost	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Boustany	Garrett	Latta
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Lipinski
Brat	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Bridenstine	Goodlatte	Long
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Loudermilk
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	Love
Buchanan	Granger	Lucas
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Graves (LA)	Lummis
Byrne	Graves (MO)	MacArthur
Calvert	Griffith	Marchant
Carter (GA)	Grothman	Marino
Carter (TX)	Guinta	Massie
Chabot	Guthrie	McCarthy
Chaffetz	Hardy	McCaul
Clawson (FL)	Harper	McClintock
Cole	Harris	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Hartzler	McKinley
Collins (NY)	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Comstock	Hensarling	Rodgers
Conaway	Hice, Jody B.	Meadows
Cook	Hill	Messer
Cramer	Holding	Mica
Crawford	Hudson	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Huizenga (MI)	Moolenaar
Culberson	Hultgren	Mooney (WV)
Davis, Rodney	Hunter	Mullin
Denham	Hurd (TX)	Mulvaney
DeSantis	Hurt (VA)	Murphy (PA)
DesJarlais	Issa	Neugebauer

Newhouse	Rooney (FL)	Tipton
Noem	Ros-Lehtinen	Trott
Nugent	Roskam	Turner
Nunes	Ross	Upton
Olson	Rothfus	Valadao
Palazzo	Rouzer	Walberg
Palmer	Royce	Walden
Paulsen	Russell	Walker
Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Walorski
Perry	Salmon	Walters, Mimi
Peterson	Sanford	Weber (TX)
Pittenger	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Pitts	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Pompeo	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Posey	Sessions	Whitfield
Price, Tom	Shimkus	Williams
Ratcliffe	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Reichert	Simpson	Wittman
Renacci	Smith (MO)	Womack
Ribble	Smith (NE)	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Rigell	Smith (TX)	Yoho
Roby	Stewart	Young (AK)
Roe (TN)	Stivers	Young (IA)
Rogers (AL)	Stutzman	Zeldin
Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)	Zinke
Rohrabacher	Thornberry	
Rokita	Tiberi	

NAYS—192

Adams	Foster	Moore
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Moulton
Ashford	Fudge	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Gabbard	Nadler
Beatty	Gallo	Napolitano
Becerra	Garamendi	Neal
Bera	Gibson	Nolan
Beyer	Graham	Norcross
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	O'Rourke
Blumenauer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bonamici	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Boyle, Brendan F.	Grijalva	Payne
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Hanna	Peters
Bustos	Hastings	Pingree
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Capps	Higgins	Polis
Capuano	Himes	Price (NC)
Cardenas	Honda	Quigley
Carney	Hoyer	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Reed
Cartwright	Israel	Rice (NY)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Jolly	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Katko	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cleaver	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Coffman	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kildee	Schiff
Connolly	Kilmer	Schrader
Conyers	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
Costa	Kuster	Serrano
Costello (PA)	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Curbelo (FL)	Lawrence	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lee	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Levin	Speier
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Stefanik
DeGette	Loeb sack	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Lofgren	Takai
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Takano
DeBene	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
Dent	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Titus
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
Dingell	(NM)	Torres
Doggett	Lynch	Tsongas
Dold	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Doyle, Michael F.	Carolyn	Vargas
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Edwards	Matsui	Vela
Ellison	McCollum	Velázquez
Engel	McDermott	Visclosky
Eshoo	McGovern	Walz
Esty	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Farr	McSally	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meehan	Welch
	Meeks	Wilson (FL)
	Meng	

NOT VOTING—11

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Poliquin	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Hinojosa	Wagner	Young (IN)

□ 2308

Mr. BARLETTA changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2028.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2310

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 57, line 11.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. RUIZ of California.

Amendment by Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

Amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. BYRNE of Alabama.

Amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. SWALWELL of California.

Amendment by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment by Mr. HUDSON of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 295, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—126

Allen	Guthrie	Pitts
Amash	Harris	Poe (TX)
Babin	Hartzler	Poliquin
Benishkek	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Black	Holding	Price, Tom
Blackburn	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rokita
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (GA)	Issa	Roskam
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Royce
Coffman	Jordan	Russell
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Knight	Salmon
Cook	Labrador	Sanford
Cramer	LaMalfa	Scalise
Culberson	Lance	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Long	Sensenbrenner
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Sessions
Duffy	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Smith (NE)
Duncan (TN)	McCauley	Smith (TX)
Emmer (MN)	McClintock	Stutzman
Farenthold	McHenry	Thornberry
Fleming	Meadows	Walberg
Flores	Messer	Walker
Forbes	Mica	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gosar	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
Gowdy	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Nugent	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Olson	Woodall
Graves (LA)	Palmer	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Paulsen	Yoho
Grothman	Perry	Zinke

NOES—295

Abraham	Brown (FL)	Collins (NY)
Adams	Brownley (CA)	Comstock
Aderholt	Buchanan	Connolly
Aguilar	Bucshon	Conyers
Amodei	Bustos	Cooper
Ashford	Butterfield	Costa
Barletta	Byrne	Costello (PA)
Barr	Calvert	Courtney
Barton	Capps	Crawford
Bass	Capuano	Crenshaw
Beatty	Cárdenas	Crowley
Becerra	Carney	Cuellar
Bera	Carson (IN)	Curbelo (FL)
Beyer	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	DeFazio
Blum	Chu, Judy	DeGette
Blumenauer	Cicilline	Delaney
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bost	Clarke (NY)	DeBene
Boustany	Clay	Denham
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	Dent
F.	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Deutch
Brooks (IN)	Cole	Diaz-Balart

Dingell	Langevin	Rice (NY)
Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Dold	Larson (CT)	Rigell
Doyle, Michael	Latta	Roby
F.	Lawrence	Roe (TN)
Duckworth	Lee	Rogers (AL)
Edwards	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Ellison	Lieu, Ted	Ros-Lehtinen
Ellmers (NC)	Lipinski	Rothfus
Engel	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Eshoo	Loeb sack	Ruiz
Esty	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Farr	Love	Rush
Fattah	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)
Fincher	Lowe	Sanchez, Linda
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	T.
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Sanchez, Loretta
Fortenberry	Lujan Grisham	Sarbanes
Foster	(NM)	Schakowsky
Fox	Luján, Ben Ray	Schiff
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Schrader
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Schweikert
Fudge	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Gabbard	MacArthur	Scott, David
Gallego	Maloney,	Serrano
Garamendi	Carolyn	Sewell (AL)
Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Sherman
Gibson	Marino	Shimkus
Goodlatte	Matsui	Shuster
Graham	McCarthy	Simpson
Grayson	McCollum	Sinema
Green, Al	McDermott	Sires
Green, Gene	McGovern	Slaughter
Griffith	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Grijalva	McMorris	Speier
Guinta	Rodgers	Stefanik
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Stewart
Hahn	McSally	Stivers
Hanna	Meehan	Swalwell (CA)
Hardy	Meeks	Takai
Harper	Meng	Takano
Hastings	Moolenaar	Thompson (CA)
Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (MS)
Heck (WA)	Moore	Thompson (PA)
Higgins	Moulton	Tiberi
Hill	Mullin	Tipton
Himes	Murphy (FL)	Titus
Honda	Murphy (PA)	Tonko
Hoyer	Nadler	Torres
Huffman	Napolitano	Trott
Hurd (TX)	Neal	Tsongas
Israel	Newhouse	Turner
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Upton
Jeffries	Norcross	Valadao
Jenkins (WV)	Nunes	Van Hollen
Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke	Vargas
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Veasey
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Vela
Jolly	Pascrell	Velázquez
Joyce	Payne	Visclosky
Kaptur	Pearce	Walden
Katko	Pelosi	Walz
Keating	Perlmutter	Waters, Maxine
Kelly (IL)	Peters	Watson Coleman
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Welch
Kennedy	Pingree	Wenstrup
Kildee	Pittenger	Westerman
Kilmer	Pocan	Whitfield
Kind	Polis	Williams
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley	Womack
Kirkpatrick	Rangel	Young (AK)
Kline	Reed	Young (IA)
Kuster	Reichert	Zeldin
Lamborn	Renacci	

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2314

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

poned and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 249, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—172

Adams	Fudge	Neal
Aguilar	Gabbard	Nolan
Amash	Gallego	Norcross
Bass	Gibson	O'Rourke
Beatty	Grayson	Pallone
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Bera	Guinta	Pelosi
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Pingree
Bonamici	Heck (NV)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Polis
F.	Higgins	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Himes	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Honda	Ribble
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Huffman	Richmond
Butterfield	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Jackson Lee	Royce
Capuano	Jeffries	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Carson (IN)	Jones	Sanchez, Linda
Cartwright	Keating	T.
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sanford
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kind	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Schrader
Clay	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Lawrence	Scott, David
Clyburn	Lee	Serrano
Cohen	Levin	Sherman
Connolly	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
Conyers	Lipinski	Sires
Cooper	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Costa	Lofgren	Speier
Courtney	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Crowley	Lowe	Takai
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	(NM)	Titus
Delaney	Lynch	Tonko
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Torres
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Tsongas
Deutch	McCollum	Van Hollen
Doggett	McDermott	Vargas
Duckworth	McGovern	Veasey
Edwards	McNerney	Velázquez
Ellison	Meeks	Walters, Mimi
Engel	Meng	Walz
Eshoo	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Farr	Mulvaney	Welch
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Nadler	Yoho
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	

NOES—249

Abraham	Boustany	Cole
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Allen	Brat	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Bridenstine	Comstock
Ashford	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Barletta	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Barr	Bucshon	Cramer
Barton	Burgess	Crawford
Benishkek	Byrne	Crenshaw
Bilirakis	Calvert	Cuellar
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Black	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chaffetz	DeLauro
Blum	Clawson (FL)	Denham
Bost	Coffman	Dent

DeSantis King (IA)
DesJarlais King (NY)
Diaz-Balart Kinzinger (IL)
Dingell Kirkpatrick
Dold Kline
Doyle, Michael F. Knight
Duffy Labrador
Duncan (SC) LaMalfa
Duncan (TN) Lamborn
Ellmers (NC) Lance
Emmer (MN) Larsen (WA)
Farenthold Larson (CT)
Fincher Latta
Fitzpatrick LoBiondo
Fleischmann Long
Fleming Loudermilk
Flores Love
Forbes Lucas
Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
Foxy Lummis
Franks (AZ) MacArthur
Frelinghuysen Maloney, Carolyn
Garamendi Marchant
Garrett Marino
Gibbs Massie
Gohmert McCarthy
Goodlatte McCaul
Gosar McClintock
Gowdy McHenry
Graham McKinley
Granger McMorris
Graves (GA) Rodgers
Graves (LA) McSally
Graves (MO) Meadows
Green, Al Meehan
Green, Gene Messer
Griffith Mica
Grothman Miller (FL)
Guthrie Miller (MI)
Hanna Moolenaar
Hardy Mooney (WV)
Harper Mullin
Harris Murphy (PA)
Hartzler Neugebauer
Hensarling Newhouse
Hice, Jody B. Noem
Hill Nugent
Holding Nunes
Hudson Olson
Huelskamp Palazzo
Huizenga (MI) Palmer
Hultgren Pascarell
Hunter Paulsen
Hurd (TX) Pearce
Hurt (VA) Perry
Issa Peterson
Jenkins (KS) Pittenger
Jenkins (WV) Pitts
Johnson (OH) Poe (TX)
Johnson, Sam Poliquin
Jolly Pompeo
Jordan Posey
Joyce Price (NC)
Kaptur Price, Tom
Katko Ratcliffe
Kelly (PA) Reed

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis
Cummings Smith (WA)
Herrera Beutler Wagner
Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2317

Mrs. DINGELL changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 244, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—177

Abraham Harper
Aderholt Harris
Allen Hartzer
Amodei Hensarling
Babin Hice, Jody B.
Barletta Holding
Barr Hudson
Barton Huelskamp
Benishek Rigell
Bilirakis Hultgren
Bishop (MI) Hunter
Bishop (UT) Hurd (TX)
Black Hurt (VA)
Blackburn Issa
Bost Jenkins (WV)
Boustany Johnson (OH)
Brat Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger

Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Zinke

NOES—244

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos

Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gohmert
Graham
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis
Cummings Smith (WA)
Herrera Beutler Wagner
Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2320

Mr. AMODEI changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

AYES—173

Adams	Garamendi	Neal
Aguilar	Gibson	Nolan
Bass	Grayson	Norcross
Beatty	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bera	Hahn	Pascarell
Beyer	Hastings	Payne
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Peters
F.	Honda	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brat	Huffman	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Price (NC)
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Butterfield	Jeffries	Rangel
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Reichert
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Kaptur	Royce
Carson (IN)	Katko	Ruiz
Cartwright	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Kildee	T.
Ciциlline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kind	Sanford
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Clay	Kuster	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Langevin	Schiff
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Connolly	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee	Scott, David
Cooper	Levin	Serrano
Courtney	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sires
Davis, Danny	Loftgren	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Speier
DeGette	Lowe y	Stewart
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Swallwell (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Takai
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Deutch	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Titus
Doggett	Maloney,	Tonko
Duckworth	Carolyn	Torres
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Ellison	Matsui	Van Hollen
Engel	McCollum	Vargas
Eshoo	McDermott	Veasey
Esty	McGovern	Velázquez
Farr	McNerney	Visclosky
Fattah	Meeks	Walz
Fortenberry	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moore	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Nadler	Yoho
Gallego	Napolitano	

NOES—248

Abraham	Brown (FL)	Cuellar
Aderholt	Buchanan	Culberson
Allen	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Amash	Burgess	Davis, Rodney
Amodei	Byrne	Delaney
Ashford	Calvert	Denham
Babin	Carter (GA)	Dent
Barletta	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Barr	Chabot	DesJarlais
Barton	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Bishop (GA)	Coffman	F.
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Duffy
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Black	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Comstock	Elmers (NC)
Blum	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Bost	Cook	Farenthold
Boustany	Costa	Fincher
Brady (TX)	Costello (PA)	Fitzpatrick
Bridenstine	Cramer	Fleischmann
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Fleming
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Flores

Forbes	Loudermilk	Rooney (FL)
Fox	Love	Ros-Lehtinen
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Roskam
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Ross
Garrett	Lummis	Rothfus
Gibbs	MacArthur	Rouzer
Gohmert	Marchant	Russell
Goodlatte	Marino	Ryan (OH)
Gosar	Massie	Ryan (WI)
Gowdy	McCarthy	Salmon
Graham	McCaul	Scalise
Granger	McClintock	Schweikert
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Scott, Austin
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Sensenbrenner
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Sessions
Green, Al	Rodgers	Shimkus
Green, Gene	McSally	Shuster
Griffith	Meadows	Simpson
Grothman	Meehan	Sinema
Guinta	Messer	Smith (MO)
Guthrie	Mica	Smith (NE)
Hanna	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hardy	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Harper	Moolenaar	Stefanik
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Stewart
Hartzler	Mullin	Stivers
Heck (NV)	Mulvaney	Stutzman
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (MS)
Hice, Jody B.	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)
Hill	Newhouse	Thornberry
Holding	Noem	Tiberi
Hudson	Nugent	Tipton
Huelskamp	Nunes	Troott
Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Turner
Hultgren	Palazzo	Upton
Hunter	Palmer	Valadao
Hurd (TX)	Paulsen	Vela
Hurt (VA)	Pearce	Walberg
Issa	Perry	Walden
Jenkins (KS)	Peterson	Walker
Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Walorski
Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Walters, Mimi
Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
Jolly	Poliquin	Webster (FL)
Jordan	Pompeo	Wenstrup
Joyce	Posey	Westerman
Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom	Westmoreland
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Whitfield
King (NY)	Reed	Williams
Kinzie (IL)	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
Kline	Ribble	Wittman
Knight	Rice (SC)	Womack
Labrador	Richmond	Woodall
LaMalfa	Rigell	Yoder
Lamborn	Roby	Young (AK)
Lance	Roe (TN)	Young (IA)
Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Zinke
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	
Long	Rokita	

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2324

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 282, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

AYES—139

Aderholt	Grothman	Perry
Allen	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amash	Hardy	Pitts
Babin	Harris	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hartzler	Poliquin
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Black	Holding	Price, Tom
Blackburn	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Byrne	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)
Chaffetz	Jones	Ross
Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	Knight	Rouzer
Conaway	Labrador	Royce
Cook	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	Lamborn	Salmon
Crenshaw	Long	Sanford
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Scalise
DeSantis	Love	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Duffy	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Sessions
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	McClintock
Farenthold	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Fincher	McMorris	Stutzman
Fleming	Rodgers	Thornberry
Flores	Meadows	Walberg
Forbes	Messer	Walker
Fox	Mica	Walorski
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gosar	Neugebauer	Williams
Gowdy	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Olson	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Woodall
Graves (LA)	Palmer	Yoder
		Yoho

NOES—282

Abraham	Clarke (NY)	Engel
Adams	Clay	Eshoo
Aguilar	Cleaver	Esty
Amodei	Clyburn	Farr
Ashford	Coffman	Fattah
Barletta	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Cole	Fleischmann
Bass	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Beatty	Comstock	Foster
Becerra	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Benishek	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Bera	Cooper	Fudge
Beyer	Costa	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Gallego
Bishop (MI)	Courtney	Garamendi
Blum	Crawford	Gibson
Blumenauer	Crowley	Graham
Bonamici	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Grayson
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Boyle, Brendan	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
F.	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Brooks (IN)	DeGette	Guinta
Brown (FL)	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Brownley (CA)	DeLauro	Hahn
Buchanan	DelBene	Hanna
Bucshon	Denham	Harper
Bustos	Dent	Hastings
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Capps	Diaz-Balart	Higgins
Capuano	Dingell	Hill
Cárdenas	Doggett	Himes
Carney	Dold	Honda
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael	Hoyer
Cartwright	F.	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Israel
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Chu, Judy	Ellison	Jeffries
Ciциlline	Elmers (NC)	Jenkins (WV)
Clark (MA)	Emmer (MN)	Johnson (GA)

Johnson (OH) Meehan
 Johnson, E. B. Meeks
 Jolly Meng
 Joyce Moolenaar
 Kaptur Moore
 Katko Moulton
 Keating Mullin
 Kelly (IL) Murphy (FL)
 Kelly (PA) Murphy (PA)
 Kennedy Nadler
 Kildee Napolitano
 Kilmer Neal
 Kind Newhouse
 King (IA) Noem
 King (NY) Nolan
 Kinzinger (IL) Norcross
 Kirkpatrick Nugent
 Kline O'Rourke
 Kuster Pallone
 Lance Pascrell
 Langevin Paulsen
 Larsen (WA) Payne
 Larson (CT) Pearce
 Latta Pelosi
 Lawrence Perlmutter
 Lee Peters
 Levin Peterson
 Lieu, Ted Pingree
 Lipinski Pocan
 LoBiondo Polis
 Loeb sack Price (NC)
 Lofgren Quigley
 Lowenthal Rangel
 Lowey Reed
 Lucas Reichert
 Luetkemeyer Renacci
 Lujan Grisham Rice (NY)
 (NM) Richmond
 Lujan, Ben Ray Roby
 (NM) Ros-Lehtinen
 Lynch Roskam
 MacArthur Roybal-Allard
 Maloney, Carolyn Ruiz
 Maloney, Sean Ruppersberger
 Marino Rush
 Matsui Russell
 McCaul Ryan (OH)
 McCollum Sanchez, Linda
 McDermott T.
 McGovern Sanchez, Loretta
 McKinley Sarbanes
 McNerney Schakowsky
 McCally Schiff
 Schrader

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis
 Cummings Smith (WA)
 Herrera Beutler Wagner
 Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2327

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 110, noes 311, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]
 AYES—110
 Amash
 Babin
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Carter (GA)
 Stewart Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Collins (GA)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cramer
 Culberson
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Grothman
 Harris
 Hensarling
 Hice, Jody B.
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Jenkins (KS)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 LaMalfa
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lummis
 Marchant
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Messer
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Mulvaney
 Neugebauer
 Olson
 Palmer
 Perry
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Roe (TN)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ross
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Smith (MO)
 Stutzman
 Thornberry
 Walberg
 Weber (TX)
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho

NOES—311

Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Courtney
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Curbelo (FL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Bucusan
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Hill
 Himes
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jolly
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Knight
 Kuster
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo

Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Lujan, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Matsui
 McCaul
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNerney
 McCally
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mica
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pocan
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rigell
 Roby
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stivers
 Stewart
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Trott
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Walz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Westerman
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Womack
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck Lewis
 Cummings Smith (WA)
 Herrera Beutler Wagner
 Hinojosa Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2330

Mr. PITTENGER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 246, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

AYES—175

Adams	Grayson	Napolitano
Amash	Grijalva	Nolan
Bass	Grothman	Norcross
Beatty	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Becerra	Hahn	Pallone
Bera	Hastings	Payne
Beyer	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Higgins	Peters
Bonamici	Holding	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan F.	Honda	Pitts
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brat	Hudson	Poliquin
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pompeo
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Capps	Israel	Quigley
Cardenas	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Carney	Jeffries	Ribble
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cartwright	Jones	Rice (SC)
Castor (FL)	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Kaptur	Rokita
Chaffetz	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Royce
Ciilline	Kennedy	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clay	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Sanford
Cohen	Kuster	Sarbanes
Conyers	Labrador	Schakowsky
Crowley	Langevin	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Schweikert
DeFazio	Lee	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Levin	Scott, David
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Sensenbrenner
DelBene	Loeb sack	Serrano
DeSantis	Lofgren	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Love	Sires
Deutch	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Dingell	Lowe y	Speier
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Stutzman
Edwards	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Lynch	Takai
Engel	Maloney,	Takano
Eshoo	Carolyn	Titus
Farr	Massie	Tonko
Fattah	Matsui	Tsongas
Foxx	McCollum	Van Hollen
Frankel (FL)	McDermott	Vargas
Franks (AZ)	McGovern	Velázquez
Fudge	Meadows	Walz
Gabbard	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Gallego	Meng	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Miller (FL)	Welch
Garrett	Moore	Wenstrup
Gibson	Moulton	Woodall
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Yoho
Gowdy	Murphy (FL)	
	Nadler	

NOES—246

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Ellmers (NC)
Aderholt	Clyburn	Emmer (MN)
Aguilar	Coffman	Esty
Allen	Cole	Farenthold
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Ashford	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Babin	Comstock	Fleischmann
Barletta	Conaway	Fleming
Barr	Connolly	Flores
Barton	Cook	Forbes
Benishkek	Cooper	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Costa	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (MI)	Courtney	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Goodlatte
Black	Crawford	Gosar
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Graham
Blum	Cuellar	Granger
Bost	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Brady (TX)	Davis, Danny	Graves (MO)
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Green, Al
Brooks (IN)	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Brown (FL)	Denham	Griffith
Buchanan	Dent	Guinta
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Bustos	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Butterfield	Dold	Hardy
Byrne	Doyle, Michael F.	Harper
Calvert	F.	Harris
Capuano	Duckworth	Hartzler
Carter (GA)	Duffy	Heck (NV)
Carter (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling
Castro (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hice, Jody B.

Hill	Meehan	Schrader
Himes	Messer	Scott, Austin
Hultgren	Mica	Sessions
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Sewell (AL)
Hurd (TX)	Moolenaar	Shimkus
Hurt (VA)	Mooney (WV)	Shuster
Issa	Mullin	Simpson
Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	Sinema
Jenkins (WV)	Neal	Smith (MO)
Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Johnson, E. B.	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Smith (TX)
Jolly	Nugent	Stefanik
Joyce	Nunes	Stewart
Katko	Olson	Stivers
Kelly (PA)	Palazzo	Thompson (CA)
King (IA)	Palmer	Thompson (MS)
King (NY)	Pascrell	Thompson (PA)
Kinzinger (IL)	Paulsen	Thornberry
Kline	Pearce	Tiberi
Knight	Perlmutter	Tipton
LaMalfa	Perry	Torres
Lamborn	Peterson	Trott
Lance	Pittenger	Turner
Larsen (WA)	Poe (TX)	Upton
Larson (CT)	Posey	Valadao
Latta	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lipinski	Ratcliffe	Vela
LoBiondo	Reed	Visclosky
Long	Reichert	Walberg
Loudermilk	Renacci	Walden
Lucas	Richmond	Walker
Luetkemeyer	Rigell	Walorski
Lujan, Ben Ray	Roby	Walters, Mimi
(NM)	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
MacArthur	Rogers (KY)	Westerman
Maloney, Sean	Rooney (FL)	Westmoreland
Marchant	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Marino	Roskam	Williams
McCarthy	Ross	Wilson (FL)
McCaul	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Rouzer	Wittman
McHenry	Ruppersberger	Womack
McKinley	Russell	Yoder
McMorris	Ryan (OH)	Young (AK)
Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	Young (IA)
McNerney	Salmon	Zeldin
McSally	Scalise	Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2332

Mr. ASHFORD changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 219, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—202

Adams	Foster	Nadler
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Napolitano
Ashford	Fudge	Neal
Bass	Gabbard	Nolan
Beatty	Gallego	Norcross
Becerra	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Benishkek	Gibson	Pallone
Bera	Graham	Pascrell
Beyer	Grayson	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Blum	Griffith	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Peters
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hahn	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Harris	Pocan
Brooks (AL)	Hastings	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Heck (NV)	Posey
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Higgins	Quigley
Capps	Himes	Reichert
Capuano	Honda	Rice (NY)
Cardenas	Huffman	Richmond
Carney	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Jones	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciilline	Katko	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Clay	Kennedy	Schrader
Cleaver	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kilmer	Scott, David
Cohen	Kind	Sensenbrenner
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Conyers	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lance	Sherman
Costa	Langevin	Sinema
Costello (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Lee
Crowley	Lawrence	Levin
Cuellar	Lee	Lieu, Ted
Curbelo (FL)	Levin	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Loeb sack
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Lofgren
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Lowenthal
DeGette	Lofgren	Lowe y
Delaney	Lowenthal	Lujan Grisham
DeLauro	Maloney,	(NM)
DelBene	Carolyn	Luján, Ben Ray
Denham	Maloney, Sean	(NM)
Dent	Matsui	Lynch
DeSaulnier	McCollum	MacArthur
Deutch	McDermott	Maloney,
Dingell	McGovern	Carolyn
Doggett	McNerney	Maloney, Sean
Dold	McSally	Doyle, Michael F.
Doyle, Michael F.	Meeks	Duckworth
Duckworth	Meng	Edwards
Edwards	Moore	Ellison
Ellison	Moulton	Engel
Engel	Murphy (FL)	Eshoo
Eshoo		Esty
Farr		Farr
Fattah		Fattah
Fitzpatrick		Fitzpatrick

NOES—219

Abraham	Byrne	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Calvert	Ellmers (NC)
Allen	Carter (GA)	Emmer (MN)
Amash	Carter (TX)	Farenthold
Amodei	Chabot	Fincher
Babin	Chaffetz	Fleischmann
Barletta	Clawson (FL)	Fleming
Barr	Coffman	Flores
Barton	Cole	Forbes
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Bishop (MI)	Collins (NY)	Foxx
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Franks (AZ)
Black	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Blackburn	Cook	Garrett
Bost	Cramer	Gibbs
Boustany	Crawford	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Brat	Culberson	Gosar
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Granger
Brown (FL)	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Graves (LA)
Bucshon	Duffy	Graves (MO)
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Green, Al

Grothman	McClintock	Rothfus	Boyle, Brendan	Griffith	Nolan	Long	Pearce	Smith (MO)
Guinta	McHenry	Rouzer	F.	Grijalva	Norcross	Loudermilk	Perry	Smith (NE)
Guthrie	McKinley	Royce	Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke	Love	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Hanna	McMorris	Russell	Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Pallone	Lucas	Pittenger	Smith (TX)
Hardy	Rodgers	Ryan (OH)	Bustos	Hastings	Pascarell	Luetkemeyer	Pitts	Stefanik
Harper	Meadows	Ryan (WI)	Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Payne	Lujan Grisham	Poe (TX)	Stewart
Hartzler	Meehan	Salmon	Capps	Higgins	Pelosi	(NM)	Poliquin	Stivers
Hensarling	Messer	Sanford	Capuano	Himes	Perlmutter	Luján, Ben Ray	Pompeo	Stutzman
Hice, Jody B.	Mica	Schalise	Cárdenas	Honda	Peters	(NM)	Posey	Swalwell (CA)
Hill	Miller (FL)	Schweikert	Cicilline	Hoyer	Pingree	Lummi	Price, Tom	Thompson (MS)
Holding	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin	Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Pocan	MacArthur	Ratcliffe	Thompson (PA)
Hoyer	Moolenaar	Sessions	Cartwright	Huffman	Polis	Maloney, Sean	Reed	Thornberry
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Shimkus	Castor (FL)	Israel	Price (NC)	Marchant	Reichert	Tiberi
Huelskamp	Mullin	Shuster	Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Quigley	Marino	Renacci	Tipton
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Simpson	Cicilline	Jeffries	Rangel	McCarthy	Richmond	Tipton
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)	Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Ribble	McCaul	Rigell	Tonko
Hunter	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)	Clarke (NY)	Jones	Rice (NY)	McClintock	Roby	Trott
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Smith (NJ)	Clay	Kaptur	Rice (SC)	McHenry	Roe (TN)	Turner
Hurt (VA)	Noem	Smith (TX)	Cleaver	Keating	Rohrabacher	McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Upton
Issa	Nugent	Stewart	Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard	McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Stutzman	Connolly	Kennedy	Royce	Rodgers	Rokita	Vela
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Thompson (PA)	Conyers	Kildee	Ruiz	McSally	Rooney (FL)	Walberg
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Thornberry	Cooper	Kilmer	Rush	Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Johnson, E. B.	Palmer	Tiberi	Crowley	Kind	Ryan (OH)	Meehan	Roskam	Walker
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Tipton	Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda	Messer	Ross	Walorski
Jolly	Pearce	Trott	Davis, Danny	Kuster	T.	Mica	Walters, Mimi	Webster (FL)
Jordan	Perry	Turner	Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta	Miller (FL)	Rouzer	Webster (FL)
Joyce	Pittenger	Upton	DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Sanford	Miller (MI)	Ruppersberger	Wenstrup
Kelly (PA)	Pitts	Valadao	DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes	Moolenaar	Russell	Westerman
King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Walberg	Delaney	Lawrence	Schakowsky	Mooney (WV)	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
King (NY)	Poliquin	Walden	DeLauro	Lee	Schiff	Moulton	Salmon	Whitfield
Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Walker	DeBene	Levin	Scott (VA)	Mullin	Scalise	Williams
Kline	Price, Tom	Walorski	DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David	Murphy (FL)	Schrader	Wilson (FL)
Knight	Rangel	Walters, Mimi	Deutsch	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Labrador	Ratcliffe	Weber (TX)	Dingell	Loebach	Serrano	Neugebauer	Scott, Austin	Wittman
LaMalfa	Reed	Webster (FL)	Doggett	Lowenthal	Sires	Newhouse	Sessions	Womack
Lamborn	Renacci	Wenstrup	Doyle, Michael	Lowe	Speier	Noem	Sewell (AL)	Woodall
Latta	Ribble	Westerman	F.	Lynch	Takai	Nugent	Sherman	Yoder
LoBiondo	Rice (SC)	Whitfield	Duckworth	Maloney,	Takano	Nunes	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Long	Rigell	Westmoreland	Duncan (TN)	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)	Olson	Shuster	Young (IA)
Loudermilk	Roby	Williams	Edwards	Massie	Titus	Palazzo	Simpson	Zeldin
Love	Roe (TN)	Wittman	Ellison	Matsui	Torres	Palmer	Sinema	Zinke
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Yoder	Engel	McCollum	Tsongas	Paulsen	Slaughter	
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)	Eshoo	McDermott	Van Hollen			
Lummi	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)	Esty	McGovern	Vargas			
Marchant	Rokita	Zinke	Farr	McNerney	Veasey			
Marino	Rooney (FL)		Fattah	Meeks	Velázquez			
Massie	Ros-Lehtinen		Foster	Meng	Visclosky			
McCarthy	Roskam		Frankel (FL)	Moore	Walz			
McCaul	Ross		Fudge	Mulvaney	Waters, Maxine			
			Gallego	Nadler	Watson Coleman			
			Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch			
			Grayson	Neal	Yoho			

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2335

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 257, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

AYES—164

Adams	Beatty	Beyer
Amash	Becerra	Blumenauer
Bass	Bera	Bonamici

NOES—257

Abraham	Cook	Green, Al
Aderholt	Costa	Green, Gene
Aguilar	Costello (PA)	Grothman
Allen	Courtney	Guinta
Amodei	Cramer	Guthrie
Ashford	Crawford	Hanna
Babin	Crenshaw	Hardy
Barletta	Cuellar	Harper
Barr	Culberson	Harris
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Hartzler
Benish	Denham	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	Dent	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	DeSantis	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Hill
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Black	Dold	Hudson
Blackburn	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Blum	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Bost	Ellmers (NC)	Hunter
Boustany	Emmer (MN)	Hurd (TX)
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Hurt (VA)
Brat	Fincher	Issa
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Brown (FL)	Flores	Johnson, E. B.
Buchanan	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Jolly
Burgess	Fox	Jordan
Byrne	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Katko
Carter (GA)	Gabbard	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Garrett	King (IA)
Castro (TX)	Gibbs	King (NY)
Chabot	Gibson	Kinzing (IL)
Chaffetz	Gohmert	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Goodlatte	Knight
Clyburn	Gosar	Labrador
Coffman	Gowdy	LaMalfa
Cole	Graham	Lamborn
Collins (GA)	Granger	Lance
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Latta
Comstock	Graves (LA)	LoBiondo
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lofgren

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2339

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 272, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

AYES—149

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Amash	Bustos	Clay
Bass	Capps	Cleaver
Beatty	Cárdenas	Cohen
Becerra	Carney	Conyers
Bera	Carson (IN)	Crowley
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Bonamici	Cicilline	DeGette
Brady (PA)	Clark (MA)	Delaney

DeLauro	Keating	Price (NC)	Miller (FL)	Renacci	Stewart	Harper	Meadows	Ryan (WI)
DeBene	Kelly (IL)	Quigley	Miller (MI)	Rice (NY)	Stivers	Harris	Messer	Salmon
DeSaulnier	Kennedy	Ribble	Moolenaar	Richmond	Stutzman	Hensarling	Mica	Sanford
Deutch	Kildee	Rice (SC)	Mooney (WV)	Rigell	Swalwell (CA)	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Dingell	Kilmer	Rohrabacher	Moulton	Roby	Thompson (MS)	Hill	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Doggett	Kind	Rokita	Mullin	Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)	Holding	Mooney (WV)	Sensenbrenner
Doyle, Michael F.	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard	Mulvaney	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry	Hudson	Mullin	Sessions
Duckworth	Kuster	Ruiz	Murphy (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi	Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	Langevin	Rush	Murphy (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Tipton	Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Shuster
Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Neal	Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Torres	Hunter	Palmer	Smith (MO)
Ellison	Larson (CT)	Neuhouse	Neuhouse	Roskam	Trott	Hurd (TX)	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Engel	Lawrence	T.	Noem	Ross	Turner	Hurt (VA)	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Eshoo	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta	Norcross	Rothfus	Upton	Jenkins (KS)	Perry	Stivers
Esty	Levin	Sarbanes	Nugent	Rouzer	Valadao	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger	Stutzman
Farr	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	Nunes	Royce	Walberg	Jordan	Pitts	Thornberry
Fattah	Loeb	Schiff	Olson	Ruppersberger	Walden	Kline	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Foster	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)	Palazzo	Russell	Walker	Knight	Poliquin	Walberg
Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Scott, David	Palmer	Ryan (WI)	Walorski	LaMalfa	Pompeo	Walker
Fudge	Maloney,	Sensenbrenner	Pascrell	Salmon	Walters, Mimi	Lamborn	Posey	Walters, Mimi
Gallo	Carolyn	Serrano	Paulsen	Sanford	Weber (TX)	Lance	Price, Tom	Weber (TX)
Garamendi	Massie	Sherman	Pearce	Scalise	Webster (FL)	Long	Ratcliffe	Webster (FL)
Grayson	Matsui	Sires	Perlmutter	Schrader	Westerman	Loudermilk	Ribble	Westerman
Green, Gene	McCollum	Speier	Perry	Schweikert	Westmoreland	Love	Rice (SC)	Williams
Griffith	McDermott	Takai	Peterson	Scott, Austin	Whitfield	Lummis	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Grijalva	McGovern	Takano	Pittenger	Sessions	Williams	Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Grothman	McNerney	Thompson (CA)	Pitts	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)	Massie	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Gutiérrez	Meeks	Titus	Poe (TX)	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)	McCarthy	Rokita	Woodall
Hahn	Meng	Tonko	Poliquin	Shuster	Wittman	McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Yoder
Hastings	Moore	Tsongas	Pompeo	Simpson	Womack	McClintock	Rothfus	Yoho
Heck (WA)	Nadler	Van Hollen	Posey	Sinema	Woodall	McHenry	Rouzer	Zinke
Higgins	Napolitano	Vargas	Price, Tom	Slaughter	Yoder	McMorris	Royce	
Himes	Nolan	Veasey	Rangel	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)	Rodgers	Russell	
Honda	O'Rourke	Vela	Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)			
Hoyer	Pallone	Velázquez	Reed	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin			
Huelskamp	Payne	Visclosky	Reichert	Smith (TX)	Zinke			
Huffman	Pelosi	Walz		Stefanik				
Jackson Lee	Peters	Waters, Maxine						
Jeffries	Pingree	Watson Coleman						
Jones	Pocan	Welch	Buck	Lewis	Wasserman			
Kaptur	Polis	Yoho	Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz			
			Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth			
			Hinojosa		Young (IN)			

NOES—272

Abraham	Crawford	Hultgren
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hunter
Aguilar	Cuellar	Hurd (TX)
Allen	Culberson	Hurt (VA)
Amodei	Curbelo (FL)	Israel
Ashford	Davis, Danny	Issa
Babin	Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)
Barletta	Denham	Jenkins (WV)
Barr	Dent	Jenkins (GA)
Barton	DeSantis	Johnson (OH)
Benishek	DesJarlais	Johnson, E. B.
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Jolly
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Joyce
Black	Ellmers (NC)	Katko
Blackburn	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (PA)
Blum	Farenthold	King (IA)
Bost	Fincher	King (NY)
Boustany	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Fleischmann	Kline
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Knight
Brat	Flores	Labrador
Bridenstine	Forbes	LaMalfa
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Brooks (IN)	Fox	Lance
Brown (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Bucshon	Gabbard	LoBiondo
Burgess	Garrett	Lofgren
Butterfield	Gibbs	Long
Byrne	Gibson	Loudermilk
Calvert	Gohmert	Love
Capuano	Goodlatte	Lucas
Carter (GA)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Carter (TX)	Gowdy	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Graham	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Granger	Luján, Ben Ray
Chabot	Graves (GA)	(NM)
Chaffetz	Graves (LA)	Lummis
Clawson (FL)	Graves (MO)	MacArthur
Clyburn	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Coffman	Guinta	Marchant
Cole	Guthrie	Marino
Collins (GA)	Hanna	McCarthy
Collins (NY)	Hardy	McCaul
Comstock	Harper	McClintock
Conaway	Harris	McHenry
Connolly	Hartzler	McKinley
Cook	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Cooper	Hensarling	Rodgers
Costa	Hice, Jody B.	McSally
Costello (PA)	Hill	Meadows
Courtney	Holding	Meehan
Cramer	Hudson	Messer
	Huizenga (MI)	Mica

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2342

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 278, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—143

Allen	Carter (GA)	Fleming
Amash	Carter (TX)	Flores
Babin	Chabot	Forbes
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Garrett
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Gibbs
Black	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Blackburn	Conaway	Goodlatte
Blum	Cook	Gosar
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gowdy
Brat	DeSantis	Granger
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Graves (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	Emmer (MN)	Grothman
Burgess	Farenthold	Guthrie
Byrne	Fincher	Hardy

NOES—278

Abraham	Delaney	Joyce
Adams	DeLauro	Kaptur
Aderholt	DeBene	Katko
Aguilar	Denham	Keating
Amodei	Dent	Kelly (IL)
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Kelly (PA)
Barletta	Deutch	Kennedy
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Kildee
Barton	Dingell	Kilmer
Bass	Doggett	Kind
Beatty	Dold	King (IA)
Becerra	Doyle, Michael F.	King (NY)
Benishek	F.	Kinzinger (IL)
Bera	Duckworth	Kirkpatrick
Beyer	Duncan (SC)	Kuster
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Labrador
Blumenauer	Ellison	Langevin
Bonamici	Ellmers (NC)	Larsen (WA)
Bost	Engel	Larson (CT)
Boustany	Eshoo	Latta
Boyle, Brendan F.	Esty	Lawrence
Brady (PA)	Farr	Lee
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Levin
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Lipinski
Bustos	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Butterfield	Foster	Loeb
Calvert	Fox	Lofgren
Capps	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Lowe
Cárdenas	Fudge	Lucas
Carney	Gabbard	Luetkemeyer
Carson (IN)	Gallo	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Garamendi	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Gibson	Luján, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Graham	(NM)
Chu, Judy	Grayson	Lynch
Cicilline	Green, Al	MacArthur
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Clarke (NY)	Griffith	Carolyn
Clay	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Cleaver	Guinta	Marino
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Cohen	Hahn	McCollum
Cole	Hanna	McDermott
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	McGovern
Comstock	Hastings	McKinley
Connolly	Heck (NV)	McNerney
Conyers	Heck (WA)	McSally
Cooper	Higgins	Meehan
Costa	Himes	Meeks
Costello (PA)	Honda	Meng
Courtney	Hoyer	Moolenaar
Cramer	Huffman	Moore
Crawford	Hultgren	Moulton
Crenshaw	Israel	Mulvaney
Crowley	Issa	Murphy (FL)
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Murphy (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	Jeffries	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Jenkins (WV)	Napolitano
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Newhouse
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Noem
DeGette	Jolly	Nolan
	Jones	Norcross

Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)

Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner

Wasserman
Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2345

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 250, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

AYES—171

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy

Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Cuellar
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DellBene
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zinke

NOES—250

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Crown
Culler
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DellBene
Denham
Dent

DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Harper
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Knight
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus

Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cummings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

Lewis
Smith (WA)
Wagner

Wasserman
Schultz
Yarmuth
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2347

Mr. GUTHRIE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

AYES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert

Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman

Guinta	McHenry	Rouzer
Guthrie	McKinley	Royce
Hardy	McMorris	Russell
Harper	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)
Harris	McSally	Salmon
Hartzler	Meadows	Sanford
Heck (NV)	Meehan	Scalise
Hensarling	Messer	Schweikert
Hice, Jody B.	Mica	Scott, Austin
Hill	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Holding	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Hudson	Moolenaar	Shimkus
Huelskamp	Mooney (WV)	Shuster
Huizenga (MI)	Mullin	Simpson
Hultgren	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Hurd (TX)	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Hurt (VA)	Newhouse	Smith (TX)
Issa	Noem	Stefanik
Jenkins (KS)	Nugent	Stewart
Jenkins (WV)	Nunes	Stivers
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Stutzman
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Jones	Palmer	Thornberry
Jordan	Paulsen	Tiberi
Joyce	Pearce	Tipton
Katko	Perry	Trott
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Turner
King (IA)	Pittenger	Upton
King (NY)	Pitts	Valadao
Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)	Walberg
Kline	Poliquin	Walden
Knight	Pompeo	Walker
Labrador	Posey	Walorski
LaMalfa	Price, Tom	Walters, Mimi
Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Weber (TX)
Lance	Reed	Webster (FL)
Latta	Renacci	Wenstrup
LoBiondo	Ribble	Westerman
Long	Rice (SC)	Westmoreland
Loudermilk	Rigell	Whitfield
Love	Roby	Williams
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Womack
MacArthur	Rohrabacher	Woodall
Marchant	Rokita	Yoder
Marino	Rooney (FL)	Yoho
Massie	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
McCarthy	Roskam	Young (IA)
McCaul	Ross	Zinke
McClintock	Rothfus	

NOES—189

Adams	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Aguilar	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Ashford	Delaney	Jolly
Barr	DeLauro	Kaptur
Bass	DelBene	Keating
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Becerra	Deutch	Kennedy
Bera	Dingell	Kildee
Beyer	Doggett	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Kind
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	F.	Kuster
Boyle, Brendan	Duckworth	Langevin
F.	Edwards	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Larson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Engel	Lawrence
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Lee
Bucshon	Esty	Levin
Bustos	Farr	Lieu, Ted
Butterfield	Fattah	Lipinski
Capps	Foster	Loeb
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	Loeb
Cárdenas	Fudge	Lowenthal
Carney	Gabbard	Lowe
Carson (IN)	Galleo	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Garamendi	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Graham	Luján, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Graves (LA)	(NM)
Chu, Judy	Grayson	Lynch
Cicilline	Green, Al	Maloney,
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Carolyn
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Clay	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Cleaver	Hahn	McCollum
Clyburn	Hanna	McDermott
Cohen	Hastings	McGovern
Connolly	Heck (WA)	McNerney
Conyers	Higgins	Meeks
Cooper	Himes	Meng
Costa	Honda	Moore
Courtney	Hoyer	Moulton
Crowley	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Cuellar	Israel	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	Neal

Nolan	Ruppersberger	Takai
Norcross	Rush	Takano
O'Rourke	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Pallone	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)
Pascarella	T.	Titus
Payne	Sanchez, Loretta	Tonko
Pelosi	Sarbanes	Torres
Perlmuter	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Peters	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pingree	Schrader	Vargas
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Veasey
Polis	Scott, David	Vela
Price (NC)	Serrano	Velázquez
Quigley	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky
Rangel	Sherman	Walz
Reichert	Sinema	Waters, Maxine
Rice (NY)	Sires	Watson Coleman
Richmond	Slaughter	Welch
Roybal-Allard	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Buck	Lewis	Wasserman
Cummings	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Herrera Beutler	Wagner	Yarmuth
Hinojosa		Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2350

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the Account "Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works." After the dollar amount, insert (increased by \$30,000,000) (decreased by \$30,000,000).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I had offered an amendment for the RECORD that was a very specific amendment, and I am going to read that:

The Secretary shall accept from the Trinity River Authority of Texas, if received by October 31, 2015, \$30,191,026 as payment in full of amounts owed to the United States, including any accrued interest, for water supply storage space in Joe Pool Lake, Texas, previously known as Lakeview Lake, under contract No. DACW63-76-C-0106.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was approved by the Corps of Engineers, approved by the Trinity River Authority, and approved by the municipalities that are obligated to purchase water that is stored in this lake. However, only one of those municipalities is actually taking the water, and because of a very high interest rate, it would never be feasible for the water to be taken by the three municipalities that are not taking it. Under this agreement, the Trinity River Authority would pay all principal and accrued interest but at an interest rate of a little over 2 percent.

The Corps has accepted it. The municipalities have accepted it. The State of Texas has accepted it. It has all been accepted. The committee of authorizing jurisdiction is supportive of it, which is the Transportation Com-

mittee. In principle, on policy, the appropriators of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle are supportive.

However, there is a point of order against the amendment as originally drafted. I respect that point of order. I respect the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member, and I respect the full committee chairman, so I have drafted the substitute amendment, which there is no point of order against. I am told that, if accepted, this will have an effect that, if the appropriators support it in principle, the Corps will accept it, and the municipalities will accept it, and we will get this problem solved.

I want to emphasize that the United States Government is going to get all of its money back with interest at the prevailing market rate of the little over 2 percent that exists today. This is not a giveaway. This is literally found money that goes back to the Corps of Engineers, and they, under the leadership of the subcommittee that Mr. SIMPSON and Ms. KAPTUR are responsible for, can designate that money however they think it is best to be obligated.

I ask for the chairman of the subcommittee to enter into a colloquy to see if he accepts this amendment in principle and is willing to work with me and Ms. JOHNSON to implement it in the appropriate fashion at the appropriate time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman would like to do and how it would be helpful to his constituents. I would be happy to continue the discussion of this issue to see if there is anything that this subcommittee can do. I will not oppose this amendment, and I will try to help accomplish this goal that the gentleman is trying to achieve. It is amazing to me that, when everybody agrees on something, how hard it can still be to get it done.

Mr. BARTON. In reclaiming my time, we are trying to give money to the Federal Government that your subcommittee can use. It is a good amendment. I appreciate your support, Mr. Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank my friend and colleague from my home State of Texas (Mr. BARTON), who I share the lake with.

This is a commonsense amendment. I want to thank all of those who have

helped to arrive at this acceptable language for this amendment.

The language of the amendment has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office and has a zero score. More importantly, the amendment would provide a revenue for the government. It would make good on unintended consequences that came as a result of a now antiquated metric of calculating costs for such projects.

In the 1986 WRDA bill, Congress recognized this mistake in its formulas for rates and added a provision allowing for the recalculation of such project rates for ever 5 years, but it was not retroactive.

This amendment will enable the Trinity River Authority to make a final payment to the Corps of Engineers, begin providing water supply and storage, and allow the Federal Government to finally begin collecting revenue on this investment.

I will remind my colleagues these contracts are congressionally approved, but this contract was agreed to on terms no longer favorable to the U.S. Government.

The original formula has tripled the valuation of the project, and as it stands, the project will never be completed, and we will never collect on the contract. There is no existing obligation to pay for the completion of the project, so what we have now is a half-completed project and no path forward for the government to collect on its investment.

This is revenue for our government. It has a zero CBO score, and it is a commonsense amendment.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I thank all those who helped us to arrive at this point.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Is it not true there literally is an escrow account in Texas with \$30 million in it that they wish to send to the Federal Government?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. That is true. They are ready to pay it.

Mr. BARTON. Is it not true that this is what we would call found money?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, indeed; \$30 million is a lot of money for the government these days.

Mr. BARTON. Is it also not true that, if Mr. SIMPSON and Ms. KAPTUR and their subcommittee and the full committee accepts this and works in good faith to actually implement it, that the subcommittee and the full committee can use these unobligated funds in whatever fashion they see best for programs within the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. That is true.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and thank you to our ranking member and the chair for the good work that they have done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice to those in support of water power and the Bonamici-Perry-Pingree amendment.

This amendment provides a modest increase in funding for the Department of Energy's Water Power Program, but that modest increase will make a big difference in developing new sources of clean energy, tidal power, and hydro-power from all across the country.

I have seen this program work firsthand in the State of Maine. Ocean Renewable Power Company has taken advantage of this program and leveraged these modest investments into a company that has created or retained over a hundred jobs in every part of our State and directly pumped over \$25 million into our economy.

Tidal and river power projects create jobs in areas where they are needed most, in Eastport, Maine, for example, or in rural villages in Alaska. These projects lower energy prices and create jobs. For some remote communities, creating these new forms of clean energy is a matter of survival.

These projects are examples of American technology and know-how at work. By creating homegrown solutions to our energy needs, we are investing in our communities and developing technology that the rest of the world wants to buy from us. Most importantly of all, this allows us to keep the money we spend on energy right here in America.

This Department of Energy program supports private sector research and development and implementation of water power technology that creates these jobs and these new sources of clean energy. This modest increase in funding will translate directly into jobs and an increase in the supply of clean renewable energy across the country.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to thank Congresswoman PINGREE of Maine for her efforts here this evening and for her dedication to renewable energy, including in the tidal arena.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ABRAHAM

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, carry out, modify, revise, or enforce Executive Order 13690 (entitled "Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input").

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are here today because, with the stroke of a pen, President Obama has threatened decades of work by Americans and local governments to combat flooding.

Executive Order No. 13690 establishes a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard that greatly expands the area defined as flood plain and imposes unreasonable standards on any Federal activities in that expanded flood plain.

The administration crafted this policy in secret, without input on its merits from local officials or stakeholders, those stakeholders that will have to live with this policy.

The Office of Management and Budget predicts that this standard will significantly increase the cost of living and doing business in all areas that are at any risk of flooding.

This is just another case of the President imposing his climate change politics on hard-working Americans. This new standard will have a real devastating impact on communities throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that will prohibit funding for this woefully shortsighted executive order.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana, Dr. BOUSTANY, my good friend.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, the administration continues to rule using executive orders and a top-down approach without taking stakeholder voices into account. That is arbitrary, and it is just wrong.

This Federal Flood Risk Management Standard is a case in point established by executive order. The President solicited no public input on its merits before charging full speed ahead. This is horrible for Louisiana. It will be devastating for our coastal communities, inhibiting their ability to grow and develop.

This order affects critical programs like disaster preparedness assistance and Federal highway and housing aid; yet no cost-benefit analysis was ever undertaken. This is just not the way things are supposed to work around here.

I encourage all my colleagues who are concerned not only with the content of this, but the fly-by-night process by which this revision was proposed, to support our amendment and send a message to the administration that this will not stand.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr.

SCALISE), our great friend and majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. ABRAHAM, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at this proposal, the way it came about, there was not the right kind of planning and the right kind of feedback, the right kind of working with people who have been working hard on flood protection structures.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal by the President, if it were implemented, would actually make it harder to build flood protection projects. Why would the President want to bring forward a proposal that is going to make it harder for people to protect their homes from flooding?

This isn't just a south Louisiana problem; this impacts the entire Nation. There are people all around the country that would not only be threatened by the inability to build stronger flood protection, but this would also lead to dramatic increases in insurance rates on homeowners.

This proposal by the President is not only a solution in search of a problem; this is going to be a dangerous proposal that will have dramatically devastating impacts on families all across this Nation.

This is a proposal that needs to be reversed. I support it.

□ 0010

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman ABRAHAM for bringing this amendment up.

I strongly support resiliency efforts, making our communities more resilient and our ecosystem more resilient. In this case, we are taking a standard that is universally considered to be a 100-year standard and bumping it, in many cases, to a 500-year standard.

In the State of Louisiana, FEMA has gone through and tried to establish maps to determine a 100-year standard. We found areas where they are 6 feet off where they should be, yet we are going to try and go to a 500-year standard. I remind you, our Nation hasn't even been around that long.

Most concerning, Mr. Chairman, is when you combine this proposed executive order with the Waters of the U.S. proposal that clearly states that flood plains are within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, you suddenly grossly expand the Federal Government's jurisdiction over private property and prevent or obstruct or increase the cost of development on that private property.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I just want to state that in December of last year, Congress raised strong concern about this, about the huge implications of this and, therefore, they put a provision in law that required that input from stakeholders occur before this executive order be put forth, and that was ignored.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise in opposition the gentleman's amendment.

It doesn't take a mental giant to see that floods are among the most costly and frequent of all nature's hazards.

Between 1980 and 2013, the United States suffered more than \$260 billion worth of flood-related damages. Flooding accounts for approximately 85 percent of all disaster declarations in the country. And on average, more people die annually from flooding than any other natural disaster. I can tell you that even in the Midwest, which isn't one of the coastal communities, we have more significant storms of late and more rainfall and more flooding to deal with.

The costs borne by the Federal taxpayer by flooding exceed any other natural hazard. Losses caused by flooding impact our economic prosperity, public health and safety, and our national security by straining disaster response resources and increasing the frequency and cost of disaster relief.

When you look at the cost of what FEMA has to spend to try to clean up everything from basements to neighborhoods, oh, my goodness. The millions and millions of dollars that go out, the billions of dollars that go out the door because of these disasters around the country related to flooding is huge.

Flooding risks are anticipated to increase over time due to the continued occupation of flood-prone areas, the impacts of climate change, and other threats. That damage can be particularly severe to our Nation's infrastructure, including our buildings, roads, ports, industrial facilities, and even our coastal military installations.

I actually have traveled to Louisiana, and my heart goes out to the people of New Orleans and all of the surrounding areas for what they suffered. But I can tell you, I was shocked to see that there were decisions made for land planning to absolutely rebuild where all the damage had occurred. I even made suggestions in the Ninth Ward inside New Orleans. I said: Why don't you leave that open for agriculture, so that when you get another big threat from the ocean, you won't harm as many people? It was as though no one wanted to listen.

Well, God bless everyone, because nature we can't control. She does what she wants.

Federal agencies will be given the flexibility to select the best approach for establishing the flood elevation and hazard area they use in siting, design, and construction: utilizing the best available actionable data and methods that integrate current and future changes in flooding based on science and experience; 2 or 3 feet of elevation, depending on the criticality of the

building itself, above the 100-year, or 1 percent, annual chance flood elevation; or a 500-year, or 0.2 percent, annual chance flood elevation.

The new flood standard will help reduce the risk and costs and, frankly, loss of life of future flood disasters by providing a margin of safety so that federally funded structures, facilities, and infrastructure last as long as intended.

Why should we ask people who are living responsibly with the land and the forces of nature to pay for those who want to live irresponsibly with those same forces?

It seems to me that one of the most cost-effective things we can do is to be sensible about our land planning for the future, so that we avoid the harm to human life and our built environment. We are more intelligent, we hope, than we were a century ago. We have a lot more data. We have a lot more experience, and it should influence our decisions from now into the future.

I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to join me. Let's be responsible in this new century and minimize the harm, both to human life as well as taxpayers' pocketbooks.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, the good, hard-working people that live in these areas that would be affected now have not incurred floods in their lifetimes or in their generations of lifetimes before them, but this would impact some States up to 40 percent of their total landmass.

This is unacceptable. Cost of flood insurance would go astronomically high in some cases. Federal overburden would again be an issue, and businesses could not function. Even existing businesses would be put out of business.

This administration has violated the congressional intent in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2015 by crafting the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard without consulting the necessary officials and basing it on some climate issues that have no scientific basis at this point.

This standard will affect both private and federally financed development in areas considered flood plain. This means certification and accreditation of new and improved levees, issuance of section 404 Clean Water Act permits, issuance of federally backed mortgages, issuance of grants, construction of new transportation projects, and on and on would be affected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science" may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank again the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for their courtesy and, as well, for the work that they have done on this legislation.

This amendment was in this bill in the 113th in the FY 2013 Energy and Water Resources. It is a continuing effort to ensure that we focus on the need for science, technology, engineering, and math among minority populations in the United States.

The amendment prohibits the use of funds made available for science in title III of the Department of Energy programs to be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act, and addresses the need to increase programs that educate minorities in science, technology, engineering, and math.

Some almost 20 years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton, in an executive order, directed Federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chairman, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders. This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals.

As the Nation's demographics are shifting, as more and more of our children come of age, it is important that we continue to focus on improving the numbers of minorities who seek STEM opportunities. It is good for the country.

I applaud Energy Secretary Moniz' commitment, which will increase the Nation's economic competitiveness and enable our people to realize their full potential.

Mr. Chairman, there are still a great many scientific riddles to be solved, and the more people we have trained in the sciences, the more competitive our Nation will be; and the more we invest in underserved communities, the more competitive our Nation will be.

The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them. So I ask my colleagues to ensure that we continue this very important focus and emphasize the continued investment improving access to science, technology, engi-

neering, and math to, in essence, solve, or help solve, the scientific riddles that continue to be before us to improve the quality of life of all Americans.

□ 0020

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, which invests in STEM in America for those who are underserved and whose lives could be enhanced by these programs.

Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to describe my amendment, which simply provides that: "None of the funds made available by this Act for 'Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Science' may be used in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.)."

This amendment was approved and adopted in identical form on June 5, 2012, during the 112th Congress as an amendment to H.R. 5325, the Energy and Water Resources Appropriations Act of 2013.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman Simpson and Ranking Member Kaptur for their stewardship in bringing this legislation to the floor and for their commitment to preserving America's great natural environment and resources so that they can serve and be enjoyed by generations to come.

Mr. Chair, twenty years ago, on February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, directing federal agencies to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minority and low-income populations.

The Department of Energy seeks to provide equal access in these opportunities for underrepresented groups in STEM, including minorities, Native Americans, and women.

Mr. Chair, women and minorities make up 70 percent of college students, but only 45 percent of undergraduate STEM degree holders.

This large pool of untapped talent is a great potential source of STEM professionals.

As the nation's demographics are shifting and now most children under the age of one are minorities, it is critical that we close the gap in the number of minorities who seek STEM opportunities.

I applaud the Energy Secretary Moniz's commitment which will increase the nation's economic competitiveness and enable more of our people to realize their full potential.

Mr. Chair, there are still a great many scientific riddles left to be solved—and perhaps one of these days a minority engineer or biologist will come-up with some of the solutions.

The larger point is that we need more STEM educators and more minorities to qualify for them.

The energy and science education programs funded in part by this bill will help ensure that members of underrepresented communities are not placed at a disadvantage when it comes to the environmental sustainability, preservation, and health.

Through education about the importance of environmental sustainability, we can promote a broader understanding of science and how citizens can improve their surroundings.

Through community education efforts, teachers and students have also benefitted by learning about radiation, radioactive waste management, and other related subjects.

The Department of Energy places interns and volunteers from minority institutions into

energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

The DOE also works to increase low income and minority access to STEM fields and help students attain graduate degrees as well as find employment.

With the continuation of this kind of funding, we can increase diversity, provide clean energy options to our most underserved communities, and help improve their environments, which will yield better health outcomes and greater public awareness.

But most importantly businesses will have more consumers to whom they may engage in related commercial activities.

My amendment will help ensure that underrepresented communities are able to participate and contribute equitably in the energy and scientific future.

I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, printed as No. 5 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to apply the report entitled "Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas from the United States", published in the Federal Register on June 4, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 32260), in any public interest determination under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that will keep America's energy economy growing and keep good-paying jobs coming to gas-producing regions across the country, including western Pennsylvania.

The natural gas boom is transforming local economies across the country, and it is creating a new wave of opportunity for hard-working Americans who want to earn a living and provide for their families.

American ingenuity has empowered us to safely harness our tremendous energy resources, turning the United States into a breakout success story as the world's top natural gas producer. Countries in Europe and Asia, many of which are our allies, are eager to tap this abundant supply of affordable American energy. They consider America to be a much more attractive business partner and a safer alternative to their reliance on belligerent, energy-rich countries, like Russia.

Given the abundance of domestic natural gas resources, especially in the

Marcellus shale region, American energy companies are eager to accept more business and stand ready to fulfill the global demand.

We must do everything we can to help energy producers succeed so they can continue to grow, hire more workers, and bring prosperity back to our American cities.

Congress must work to lift barriers to energy exports and help domestic energy producers cut through the bureaucratic red tape that threatens to put a stranglehold on continued economic growth.

My amendment seeks to eliminate unnecessary challenges to these increased energy exports on environmental grounds. Specifically, my provision would prevent the Department of Energy from using its report entitled "Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas" in any public interest determination under the Natural Gas Act.

There are legitimate concerns that this DOE report and many of its arbitrary determinations may now be used to slow-walk or completely block much-needed liquefied natural gas export approvals. Identical language was proposed and included in last year's Energy and Water and Related Agencies appropriations bill by then-Representative BILL CASSIDY from Louisiana.

I thank Chairman SIMPSON for his hard work and support, and I urge all my colleagues who support an all-of-the-above approach to American energy independence to vote "yea" on this amendment so we can keep our energy sector booming.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, when a company wants to export liquefied natural gas, LNG, it has to submit an application with the Department of Energy. For export to countries with a free trade agreement with the United States, the Department of Energy must grant the applications without modification or delay. For export to countries without a free trade agreement, the Department of Energy must approve an export application unless it finds that the proposed export will not be consistent with the public interest.

To make this determination, the Department of Energy evaluates a range of factors when reviewing an application, including economic impacts, international considerations, U.S. energy security, and environmental effects.

The Rothfus amendment prohibits the Department of Energy from even considering one of the most important factors; that is, the impact of LNG exports on climate change.

The world's leading scientists are unequivocal: climate change is already happening on all continents and across

the oceans and will get much worse if we do not act to cut our emissions of carbon and other greenhouse gas gases. That means that we need to scrutinize the energy infrastructure decisions that we make today for their impacts on climate change in the future.

Every decision to build a new LNG export terminal has climate implications. We need to understand and weigh those effects.

Whether exporting LNG will have a positive or negative impact on global greenhouse gas emissions is a complex but critical question. Natural gas combustion for electricity emits less carbon pollution than coal. And that is good. Proponents of LNG exports argue that these exports will displace coal consumption in other countries, which could produce a climate benefit. That is good.

But LNG exports will raise natural gas prices in the United States, which could increase coal consumption and carbon pollution from coal-fired power plants. LNG exports also would drive new domestic natural gas production in the United States.

Coming from Ohio, I can guarantee you, this would increase emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, unless we take measures to control that pollution at the wellhead and throughout the natural gas system. It is a great problem to have but one we need to meet.

In a carbon-constrained world, we need to understand and consider the climate impacts of key energy policy decisions, such as building new LNG export terminals and exporting America's natural gas.

The Rothfus amendment takes a head-in-the-sand approach, I am sorry to say. The Department of Energy has completed a report examining lifecycle carbon emissions from LNG. This amendment says that the Department of Energy can't consider those findings of climate impacts when making a public interest determination. Considering climate impacts is not going to slow down the review process. It makes no sense to require the Department of Energy to make a determination without the benefit of all the facts.

Let's make enlightened decisions. Ignoring climate change will not make it go away. Quite the opposite.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Let's move to the future, not the past.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice of this administration to stall, stall, stall, delay, delay. We have had tremendous growth in our economy in western Pennsylvania and in Ohio, for that matter, given the natural gas boom that is going on.

The price of gas is suppressed right now. We see drillers even slowing down, which is affecting jobs in the gas areas. Fewer wells are being drilled.

And to take a report that the DOE has, with its arbitrary determinations,

to, again, slow-walk approvals, which is what we have been seeing with the administration—meanwhile, allies in Eastern Europe are literally being held hostage to Russia—this natural gas will be used. Natural gas will be used by these countries in Eastern Europe. They are going to use Russia's natural gas or they want to use American natural gas.

So, again, I would encourage adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are procured from a manufacturer that is part of the national technology and industrial base.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a simple and straightforward amendment to this year's Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

Every year since 1991, Congress has included a provision in the Department of Defense Appropriations bill to require that military agencies purchase anchor and mooring chain from American manufacturers.

□ 0030

My amendment simply clarifies that this requirement also applies to anchor and mooring chain purchased by the Army Corps of Engineers. Everyone in this Chamber can agree that taxpayer dollars should be used to buy goods manufactured right here at home whenever possible.

While our economy continues to recover, it is imperative that we protect and support Americans' production capabilities. Doing so not only supports employment opportunities for Americans, but also reinforces our national security.

Both Congress and the Pentagon have long recognized the importance of maintaining a strong industrial base

right here in America. While I understand that we must balance our procurement needs with shrinking budgets, we should not be putting foreign workers ahead of Americans.

My amendment is a commonsense way to protect a critical production capability, support our manufacturing industry, and put American workers first. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the removal of any Federally owned or operated dam.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will help prevent future floods, as well as protect valuable water storage and hydropower systems throughout the country.

Specifically, the Gosar-Newhouse amendment will prevent any funds in this bill from being used to remove any federally owned or operated dams. In recent years, extremist environmental groups have increased efforts to dismantle and remove Federal dams. These efforts defy common sense, particularly at a time of major water challenges across the West and with an increasing need for clean, renewable hydropower.

The gentleman from Washington has seen these attempts firsthand, and I am grateful for Congressman NEWHOUSE's leadership in coleading this amendment.

Electricity generated from the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation operated dams is utilized by millions of Americans every day and represents the largest source of renewable energy in this country.

These dams are multiuse facilities that provide navigation, hydropower, and important recreational benefits. Fringe efforts to remove these dams are not only misguided, but extremely dangerous. Many of these dams are essential components for flood controls, strategic water storage, and life-sustaining irrigation for millions of acres of American agriculture.

Tens of millions of Americans rely on these dams to supply their drinking water and to support their livelihoods. The vital water, energy, economic, and ecological benefits provided by these federally owned and operated dams must be protected.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Corps of Engineers infrastructure and to support this amendment. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have both indicated they have no plans to remove any dams in fiscal year 2016, and both agencies don't have any issues with this amendment.

Both committees of jurisdiction have also signed off on and support the amendment. Any emergency removals will be made by a different authorization or appropriation.

With one of the worst droughts in 100 years currently transpiring in the West, there is no logical reason to oppose the commonsense Gosar-Newhouse amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my friend.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the good gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Gosar-Newhouse amendment which would prohibit any funds in this act from being used for purposes of removing Federal dams, which are a vital component of the water infrastructure in the West.

I would like to thank my good friend and colleague Congressman GOSAR for his hard work on this issue which is so important, given the devastating drought conditions facing most of the Western United States. According to the U.S. Drought Monitor for March 31, 2015, all or significant portions of 11 Western States, including the State of Washington, are suffering from severe to exceptional drought.

Given the current drought conditions facing my State and many other States in the West, now is not the time to consider removing Federal dams. These dams provide important hydropower in my State and also have conservation, recreation, and navigation benefits.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, these dams play a pivotal role in water storage, irrigation, and flood control. They also help ensure many rural and agricultural communities in the West have access to clean water supplies, providing critically important irrigation for countless agricultural operations and millions of acres of farmland.

We have fought these dam wars for decades; and, with the West facing a possible 100-year drought, now is not the time to destroy and remove these assets which benefit all of us. Removing this vital infrastructure would have a devastating impact on communities, farms, and businesses throughout the West.

This commonsense amendment will help ensure States like mine are not additionally burdened as we work to deal with impacts of mounting water shortages and drastic drought conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, and I would like to thank my good friend from Arizona for his hard work on this.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express the opinion, though I will not oppose the amendment, because there are no funds in the bill for dam removal, and I wanted to just clarify that for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that were inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill that was considered under an open rule during the 113th Congress, as well as one yesterday.

My amendment would expand the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of contractors.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to save taxpayer money, help the Department of Energy avoid duplicative programs, and ensure the agency's limited resources are focused on programs directly related to its mission to ensure energy security for the United States.

This simple amendment would prohibit the use of funds to be used for the proposed Climate Model Development and Validation program within the Department of Energy. This exact same amendment passed this body by a voice vote last year, and this year, I am also proud again to offer this commonsense policy.

The duplicative and wasteful nature of this new program has been recognized by several outside spending watchdog groups. This amendment proposal has been supported in the past by the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, The American Conservative Union, Eagle Forum, and the Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives already declined to fund the proposed climate model program in fiscal years 2014 and 2015. In previous years, the committee has proactively included language in the committee report to prohibit funding for this new program. However, such language does not exist in this year's report, making this amendment even more necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that the House of Representatives must continue its firm position that we should not be wasting precious taxpayer resources on new programs that compete with the private sector and are funded by private investment.

If funded, this program would be yet another new addition to the President's ever-growing list of duplicative global programs that have been instituted and funded all over the Federal Government in recent years.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service estimates this administration has already squandered \$77 billion from fiscal year 2008 through fiscal

year 2013 studying and trying to develop global climate change regulations.

While research and modeling of the Earth's climate and how and why Earth's climate is changing can be of value, it is not central to the Department's mission and is already being done by dozens of government, academic, business, and nonprofit organizations across the globe.

□ 0040

Considering the extensive work that is being done to research, model, and forecast climate change trends by other areas in the government, in the private sector, and internationally, funding for this specific piece of President Obama's climate agenda is not only redundant, but is also inefficient.

I thank the chairman, ranking member, and committee for their work on this bill. This amendment is about effective use of taxpayer money, and I ask my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment that passed this same body just last year.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. The Gosar amendment blocks funding for the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program. This is climate science denial at its worst.

The world's top scientific institutions are telling us that we have a rapidly closing window to reduce our carbon pollution before the catastrophic impacts of climate change cannot be avoided.

So far, the world already warmed by 0.8 degrees Celsius, and we are already seeing the effects of climate change. Most scientists agree that 2 degrees Celsius is the maximum amount we can warm without really dangerous effects, although many scientists now believe that even 2 degrees is far too much, given the effects we are already seeing. But absent dramatic action, we are on track to warm 4 to 6 degrees Celsius by midcentury. That is more than 10 degrees Fahrenheit.

The International Energy Agency has concluded that if the world does not take action to reduce carbon pollution by 2017, just 3 years from now, then it will be virtually impossible to limit warming to 2 degrees Celsius.

How do we know all of this? There are multiple lines of evidence, including direct measurements. But scientists also use sophisticated computer models of how the atmosphere and oceans work and how they respond to different atmosphere concentrations of heat-trapping gases. For projections of future emissions and their impacts, scientists have made numerous advances by collaborating across academic fields, including climatology, chemistry, biology, economics, energy dynamics, agriculture, scenario building,

and risk management. These projections are critical, as they provide guideposts to understand how quickly and how steeply the world needs to cut carbon pollution in order to avoid the worst effects of climate change.

The goal of the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program is to further improve the reliability of climate models and equip policymakers and citizens with tools to predict the current and future effects of climate change, such as sea level rise, which we know is happening, extreme weather events, and drought.

Mr. GOSAR's amendment scraps this program. It says no to enhancing the reliability of our climate models. It says no to improving our understanding of how the climate is changing. It says no to informing policymakers about the consequences of unmitigated climate change. That is absolutely irresponsible.

The amazing thing is the base bill already zeroes out funding for this program. But apparently that wasn't enough to satisfy the Republicans' climate denial. So Mr. GOSAR has offered this amendment to just reiterate the point that the House Republicans reject the overwhelming scientific evidence about climate change.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this redundant amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that we have numerous universities already doing this duplicative study, like the University of Michigan, like the University of Colorado Boulder, like Harvard University, the University of Arizona, the University of Chicago, the University of California—Berkeley—hardly squandering research.

This is a duplicative problem and program, and that is exactly what we are doing. I want to find out exactly this climate model change that we have been seeing over and over with time, but it is best to be done by those universities and those who are already there.

We have also got a dire emergency in regards to the finances that we find this country in. Duplicative services from the Department of Energy should be on their mission statement, and that is dependable energy for this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) For an additional amount for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Construction" for additional funding for ongoing work on authorized projects (except for Flood and Storm Damage Reduction, Navigation, and Environmental Infrastructure projects) there is appropriated, and the amount otherwise made available for such account is hereby reduced by, \$10,000,000.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act for "Corps of Engineers-Civil-Construction" in excess of \$276,117,000 may be used for additional funding for ongoing work on Flood and Storm Damage Reduction projects.

Mr. SIMPSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Army Corps of Engineers construction general account permits the Corps to enter into agreements with local governments and municipalities to reimburse these entities for certain funds. This allows cities across the country in both Republican and Democratic districts to take on public works projects and leverage the fact that they will later be reimbursed by the Federal Government.

The problem we face today is that millions, hundreds of millions of dollars are owed to localities across the country, and the account to pay them back this year is slated to have only \$10 million in it. Last year, that amount was \$25 million. It has gone down by \$15 million.

So for just a second, I want to give you an example of a wonderful public project in my hometown of San Antonio, Texas. The San Antonio River Authority, or SARA, recently undertook a sizable project along the San Antonio River, called the Mission Reach Ecosystem Restoration project. It has been an effort to extend, both to the north and the south, the wonderful San Antonio River Walk in San Antonio, Texas, one of the crown jewels for tourism and culture in our city. Despite the fact that this project was completed some time ago, the city is still owed much money from the Corps.

This is just one example of a wonderful public project where the Federal Government owes our cities or local entities a substantial amount of money. There are other examples in Texas, in Harris County, the Brays Bayou project in Harris County, where \$146,885,000 is pending; the White Oak Bayou project in Harris County, where \$73 million is pending; also, the Lower

Colorado River Basin, Onion Creek, in Austin has \$5 million pending. I know there is a big project in Florida.

So my effort, my amendment, is an attempt to expedite getting these local agencies paid back because they are owed so much money. I know that as we do our budget and we do our appropriations, we are talking about doling out money in the future to fund programs, but these are projects that were already completed with the promise that they would be reimbursed. They have not been reimbursed to the tune of millions and millions of dollars.

I hope that as a gesture of good faith we can increase this account by \$10 million. Bear in mind, that would still be \$5 million less than was dedicated to this account in the last year.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0050

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. I object. I am going to be opposed.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman claim time in opposition?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman have time remaining?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I reserved the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. You reserved your time. So you could yield time to the gentleman.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Absolutely.

Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, I would be glad to yield time. How much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, where I am from in Texas, when you make a deal with someone, you look him in the eye and shake his hand, honor the agreement, and keep your word.

For years, the United States Army Corps of Engineers has been making deals throughout the country. Yet, in many instances, despite project co-operation agreements, the Corps has failed to honor its end of the bargain. Many State, local, and municipal entities have advanced funding or paid out of their pockets to help better their communities with the understanding that the Federal Government would reimburse them. This is what happened in my hometown of San Antonio.

This amendment would limit expenditure on flood and storm damage reduction to \$10 million less and would add \$10 million to the "other authorized

purposes" item in the committee report. This is a matter of fairness to our communities, and if we cannot proceed with this bipartisan amendment, I hope the chairman will work with us going forward.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

First, let me assure my colleague that I am sympathetic to the intention of what he is trying to do here. The gentleman seeks to show support for additional funding for projects that are important to his district and to his constituents, and I understand that.

Unfortunately, although I know it is not the gentleman's intent, the amendment would limit all funding for the construction of flood control projects to no more than \$276 million. That is a cut of almost \$500 million in flood control projects. I would hope that we would all agree that that is unacceptable. Even as intended, though, I must oppose the amendment.

The President's budget request increased funding for environmental projects above the fiscal year 2015 level while slashing funding for flood control projects by almost \$300 million. In this bill, on the other hand, we were able to restore the flood control funding, and we did it without slashing the funding for environmental projects.

I would, respectfully, ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment even though I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. We would be more than willing to work with him—with both of you—in trying to address this issue as we move this process forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I know the appropriations process is a tough one. You are making difficult choices among many things.

I would just point out that, in this account, as you know, there have been funds that have gone unallocated in recent years in this very account from which I withdraw. Again, our local agencies in Republican and Democratic districts have already committed these funds with the promise that they would be reimbursed. A failure to reimburse them is essentially saying that we are going to stiff them on money that we said that we would pay them. This is a very small amount given the amount of money that is owed by the Corps to our local agencies.

I would ask you for your reconsideration now, and certainly, as I know how Congressman HURD feels and many others, I would ask for your help in remedying this situation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, again, I understand what he is trying to do, and I sympathize with what you are trying to do. You are correct in that the funds remain unallocated in the

flood control account. That is because, for some reason, the administration is dragging its feet on allocating these funds. It is not because the funds are not needed or cannot be used. In fact, the bill includes language to try to correct this problem. But I can't support increasing funding for environmental projects at the expense of projects that improve public safety and protect our communities.

I would offer both of the gentlemen the opportunity to work with the committee, and I will work with you to try to address this issue as we move forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS.
BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, promulgate, or enforce the Department of Energy's proposed rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnaces" (80 Fed. Reg. 48: March 12, 2015).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Energy has proposed new rulemaking that will eliminate the use of noncondensing natural gas home furnaces.

On average, condensing furnaces cost \$350 more than noncondensing furnaces and require as much as \$2,200 in additional installation costs. The DOE itself has estimated that it will cost the American consumer up to \$12 billion to install condensing furnaces nationwide. The upfront costs of installing a natural gas condensing furnace may force families to switch to alternative furnaces which are cheaper to install but that cost more to operate. Home furnaces fail and need to be replaced when people are most likely to use them—in the middle of the winter when it is cold outside. Families shouldn't have to face increased costs to replace their natural gas furnaces to get the heat flowing back into their homes.

Furthermore, the proposed rule creates a nationwide standard that fails to take into account the different climate zones throughout the country. The Department of Energy has proposed a one-size-fits-all approach that unfairly punishes Americans living in warmer climate zones such as the Southeast. This means that the payback period for

the installation of condensing furnaces in the warmer climate zones will be much longer than in the colder zones.

My amendment to this appropriations bill will prevent the Department of Energy from using funds to finalize, promulgate, or enforce the proposed rule.

My amendment has been supported by the American Gas Association, the American Public Gas Association, the Home Builders Association, the Indoor Environment and Energy Efficiency Coalition, the Air Condition, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute, and the heating and air-condition and refrigerating distributors.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Blackburn amendment because it would prevent the Department of Energy from issuing long-needed efficiency standards for residential furnaces. In the end, that will only hurt consumers and needlessly waste energy.

The current standards, which are essentially 25 years old, leave consumers with higher utility bills than are necessary. Further delays to the furnace rule will allow this situation to continue indefinitely. The new DOE standard would cut energy waste, saving consumers more than \$600 over the lifetime of their furnaces. On a national level, that will work out to savings between \$4 billion to \$19 billion. The proposed DOE standard does not apply to furnaces that are already in use. It grandfathers them or it doesn't apply to repairs that can be made to existing furnaces.

It is also worth mentioning that the Blackburn amendment would be especially negative for low-income households. Many low-income people who are renters do not get to choose the furnaces that heat their homes. Property owners will generally choose the lowest cost furnace even if that furnace will result in higher energy bills. In the end, it is the low-income renters who are stuck with the gas bills from the inefficient furnace. The DOE standard would help ensure all Americans can benefit from lower energy bills thanks to increased efficiency.

Finally, the proposed rule would save more natural gas than other rules to date and would, therefore, deliver large, cumulative greenhouse gas emission reductions at a cost savings to everyone. The Blackburn amendment would throw away that opportunity.

□ 0100

It is true that there are still some things to be worked out with the regulation, and we should move toward that end, but what the industry needs and what the consumers need is certainty going forward, so everyone can plan to build and install the latest and

most efficient technology. We should let the Department of Energy do its job.

Let's not waste time; let's not waste energy, and let's not waste money and consumer savings that will result.

I urge a "no" vote on the Blackburn amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased that my friend and colleague mentioned cost because I want to point out, again, what it would cost. These furnaces cost \$350 more and require as much as \$2,200 additional in installation cost.

In addition to that, there are alterations that are needed to existing homes for venting purposes. Those cost estimates are \$2,550 per home just for the venting that is necessary for these.

This is one of those regulations, Mr. Chairman, that is too expensive to afford. The cost on this is astronomical. Even DOE itself says the cost to the American consumer is \$12 billion to install these furnaces.

Then you say that, maybe over the lifetime of this, you are going to save an amount. I think that this is one of those areas where you look at how much it is going to cost.

This is why this amendment is so widely supported. I encourage support for the Blackburn amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS.
BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I bring every year. I told Chairman SIMPSON that I knew he was delighted to see me back on the floor again this year with the amendment for the 1 percent across-the-board spending cut.

I do want to thank the committee for its hard work in cutting, and it is important to note that the proposed funding levels for this appropriations bill this year is \$35.4 billion, which is \$633 million below the President's budget request.

I have got to say, with the situation in our Nation with our debt, I think my 1 percent spending reduction, which will save taxpayers an additional \$356 million, is something that is necessary, and it is a step that we need to take.

I am really fully aware that some of the appropriators aren't standing in favor of the 1 percent across-the-board cuts. In fact, when I offered this amendment to last year's bill, I was told that cuts of this magnitude, quite honestly, go far too deep.

Well, I think that, when you look at the fact that we need to be cutting another penny out of a dollar, that is not too deep because our debt is something that is damaging our Nation's security.

Even Admiral Mullen has said that the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our growing national debt. Because of that, we need to do a little bit more every time we come to the floor for appropriations to get this \$18.2 trillion debt under control.

As I have said before, across-the-board spending cuts effectively control the growth and cost of the Federal Government. They not only give agencies flexibility to determine which expenses are necessary, but more importantly, they don't pick winners and losers.

Not only do I support the across-the-board cuts, many of our Governors support them, Republican and Democrat. When I was in the State senate in Tennessee, we couldn't adjourn that until we balanced the budget. That is why our States are controlling their debts, reining in their expenses, and our Federal Government is not.

We kick the can down the road, go print more money, run up more debt. It is time to get it under control. Saving another penny on a dollar is a necessary step.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Tennessee's consistency.

We have seen a lot of these amendments. The problem is with the debate. You would think that we were not doing anything to reduce this deficit, that we were not cutting spending. The reality is the only committee in Congress that is actually cutting spending is the Appropriations Committee, and we have been cutting spending for the last 4 years.

Now, this bill that we have before us today meets with and falls within the budget resolution that was just adopted earlier this day, and, if we had wanted to reduce everything by 1 percent again, then we should have adopted a different budget resolution.

It is easy to say let's just take one penny out of every dollar. Who can't do that? We have taken much more than one penny out of every dollar as we have cut spending more and more in the appropriations process by the Appropriations Committee.

It is not that we don't want to reduce spending; we are reducing spending, but, of course, we could cut one more cent out of every dollar we spend. Who couldn't do that? Then we will have a

new baseline. You know what? Then we ought to cut one penny out of every dollar at that baseline. You know what? Then we will have another baseline, and we can cut one more penny out of that.

We are trying to do it smarter. We are trying to look at the needs of the agencies that we fund, reduce spending, and set priorities.

While I commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect taxpayers dollars, this is not an approach that I can support.

While the President may have proposed a budget that exceeds this bill, the increases were paid for with proposals and gimmicks that would never be enacted. This bill makes the tough choices within an allocation that adheres to the current law.

While difficult tradeoffs had to be made—and difficult tradeoffs were made—there are accounts in this bill that I think we ought to be spending more money on. There are accounts in this bill that I think we ought to be spending less money on that are a higher priority to some other Members of Congress. That is kind of the nature of how the appropriations process works. Nobody gets everything they want.

One thing we have been consistent on for the fifth year in a row is that we have been reducing spending. We prioritize funding for critical infrastructure and our Nation's defense. Most of the increases that are in this budget this year that will be coming out of the overall 302(a)'s went to the national defense, the NNSA, our nuclear weapons programs.

We prioritize funding, as I said, for critical infrastructure. The President cut \$750 million—around that—out of the harbor maintenance trust fund. In trying to secure our inland waterways and our harbors for the commerce that our economy needs, we replaced that, which means we had to make even more difficult cuts in a lot of these agencies.

These tradeoffs were carefully weighed for their respective impacts and their responsibility; yet the gentlelady's amendment would propose an across-the-board cut on every one of these programs.

This makes no distinction between where we need to be spending or investing our infrastructure, promote jobs, and meet our national security needs and where we need to limit spending to meet our deficit reduction goals.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Let me say again, I appreciate the gentlewoman's consistent effort in making sure that we keep focused on addressing what is the number one problem in this country, and that is the debt this country faces, and this committee has been doing that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

The way you balance budgets is to have a robust economy, where everybody is helping to pull the ship forward. That isn't the case right now.

What we have dug out since 2008 was the largest recession since the Great Depression. America's chief strategic vulnerability throughout this period of time—for actually over a quarter century now—and our largest area of economic loss is energy.

□ 0110

It rests in energy. Since 2003, just since 2003, our country has spent \$2.3 trillion importing foreign petroleum. That is just petroleum. That is not a country that is self-reliant. That is a country that deeply needs energy security here at home.

The result of this amendment will be less investment in the sector most critical to helping us right this hole that we have dug for ourselves.

Can you imagine if that \$2.3 trillion had been spent in this country, the number of jobs we would have, the greater amount of income and revenue we would have flowing into people's pockets and also into the public sector where we have to pay the bills?

In addition to moving us backwards on the energy front, this amendment will be less investment in water resources, and we have \$62 billion worth of Army Corps projects alone that have sat on the shelf. We have no new starts in this bill. That is not a country on the grow. That is a country in retrenchment.

So this amendment, it isn't a 50 percent cut. It is meant to send a signal. I say to the gentlelady, as I said to the chair of the Ways and Means Committee today who turned away from me and walked to the back of the Chamber, you know, it is pretty hard to balance a budget when not everybody is at work, their wages have been cut, the middle class has shrunk, but then you don't put revenues on the table.

Some of those lucrative operations, these transnational corporations have operating offshore aren't bringing their money home. They are holding it over there.

Revenues need to be on the table and mandatory spending has to be on the table.

He walked away from me, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It was a rather interesting conversation.

The Appropriations Committee can't do this alone, and we certainly shouldn't do it in sectors where America truly is hurting.

At a time when unemployed Americans are losing jobless benefits and many young families struggle just to survive, we should be creating jobs and securing the American Dream, starting with a self-reliant energy future.

This bill underfunds that. The chairman has spoken eloquently to that. And it harms American economic

growth and energy growth and energy security, and it damages those portions of our budget that are critical to our national security: vital weapons programs, our Naval research reactor research, and nonproliferation funding.

We believe our bill builds America forward to achieve progress for our country again and not retrenchment.

So I oppose the gentlelady's amendment. I think she has the right spirit, but I think she is looking in the wrong place in terms of what we face as a country. I oppose her amendment.

I yield back my the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am just so delighted that my friend mentioned what we need is a robust economy because I agree.

The Obama economy has been abysmal and has been terrible for our country. And you are exactly right. The middle class has shrunk. Wages have been cut. All that has happened.

I know the American people are sick and tired of it, and they would like to get this country moving again. And the Obama economy has caused many of the problems that are in front of us.

I am so pleased, too, that she mentioned the \$2.3 trillion that we have spent importing oil. If you look at who has been importing a lot of that oil, OPEC, exporting that to us. OPEC is one of the top five holders of our debt. That adds to both our energy security and our national security problems. Mr. Chairman, it is time to open up our lands and drill here and drill now.

Now, quite frankly, a penny on a dollar is another way to engage rank-and-file employees. I have seen it work at the State level. I know other States have used that, as I said. Both Democrat and Republican Governors have done it. My State of Tennessee did this as we reduced the size and growth of the budget in our State.

By the way, we had to do it because we were the test case for Hillary Clinton's healthcare plan, and that just threw our budget all out of whack.

So yes, we found ourselves cutting about 9 cents across the board per department.

Do across-the-board cuts work? Yes. Do they send the right message? Absolutely. Do they engage the rank and file? You better believe it. Are they a step toward getting out-of-control spending under control? Yes, they are, and we need to do that.

Every man, woman, and child in this country, right now, has over \$56,000 worth of debt that they would be responsible for. That is a per person load for our \$18.2 trillion worth of debt. We have got \$18.2 trillion worth of debt, and we can't cut another penny out of a dollar?

The chairman has done a great job. They have the right focus. I think that what we do is give them another little push, engage the bureaucracy—which, by the way, they are not having to make the cuts that men and women and small businesses are having to make. It is the fair thing to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to continue the study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, from extreme flooding to extreme drought, the Missouri River basin has been hit very hard over the past few years. The families who live and work along the Missouri River have endured great hardships, and these events serve to highlight the importance of maintaining effective flood control infrastructure.

Though it is one of our region's greatest resources, the Missouri River would produce extreme, erosive, regular flooding and be mostly unfit for navigation if not for aggressive long-term management by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress first authorized the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project, BSNP, in 1912, with the intention of mitigating flood risk and maintaining a navigable channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the river in St. Louis. Though the BSNP's construction was completed in the 1980s, the Corps' ability to make adjustments as needed remain crucial to this day.

President Obama, in his fiscal year 2015 budget, requested \$47 million for the Missouri River Recovery Program, which would primarily go towards the funding of environmental restoration studies and projects. This funding dwarfs the insufficient \$9 million that was requested for the entire operations and maintenance of the aforementioned BSNP.

It is preposterous to think that environmental projects are more important than the protection of human life. I do

not take for granted the importance of river ecosystems. I grew up near the Missouri River, as did so many of the people I represent, yet we have reached a point in our Nation in which we value the welfare of fish and birds more than the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our priorities are backwards, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment will eliminate the Missouri River Ecosystem Recovery Program, or MRERP, a study that has become little more than a tool of the environmentalists for the promotion of returning the river to its most natural state, with little regard for the flood control, navigation, trade, power generation, or the people who depend on the Missouri River for their livelihoods.

The end of the study will in no way jeopardize the Corps' ability to meet the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. MRERP is one of no fewer than 70 environmental and ecological studies focused on the Missouri River.

The people who have had to foot the bill for these studies, many of which take years to complete and are ultimately inconclusive, are the very people who have lost their farms, their businesses, and their homes.

Our vote today will also show our constituents that this Congress is aware of the gross disparity between the funding for environmental efforts and the funding for the protection of our citizens. This exact amendment has been passed by voice vote during the debate in the last three fiscal year appropriations bills, which were ultimately signed into law by President Obama. It is supported by the American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers.

□ 0120

It is time for Congress to take a serious look at the water bill and funding priorities, and it is time we send a message to our Federal entities that manage our waterways.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support our Nation's river communities and encourage more balance and Federal funding for water infrastructure and management.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, after line 11, insert the following: SEC. 507. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to purchase water to supplement or enhance the instream flow requirements in the State of California that are mandated under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, or the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, hydrologists tell us that California is facing the worst drought in 1,200 years. With the rain season officially over, our snowpack is just 3 percent of normal, and many reservoirs are already drawn down perilously. Californians are now threatened with draconian fines if they take too long in the shower.

This amendment forbids the Bureau of Reclamation from purchasing scarce water in California in the midst of this catastrophic drought for the purpose of dumping it in rivers to adjust the water temperature to nudge baby fish to swim into the ocean.

As ridiculous as this sounds, that is exactly what the Bureau of Reclamation has been doing throughout this drought. It is using money taken from families' taxes in order to purchase water that is desperately needed by these same families and then literally dumping it down the drain in front of them.

This exacerbates an already perilous scarcity of water while forcing the price of our remaining supplies even higher. It also makes a mockery of the sacrifices that every Californian is making to stretch every drop of water in their homes. And it undermines the moral authority of the government to demand further conservation from the people when it is squandering water so outrageously itself.

We don't know exactly how much the Bureau is spending for this purpose because they don't account for how their purchased water is used.

This measure would forbid them from wasting any of our water on such frivolities as adjusting water temperatures.

Now if this sounds harsh for the fish, let's remember that in a drought like this one, there would be no water in our rivers. There would be no fish. The dams make it possible to save the water from wet years so that we can get through the dry years. That doesn't work if we open floodgates in an extreme drought like this to make the fish happy.

This month, the Bureau of Reclamation released nearly 30,000 acre-feet of water from the New Melones Dam in my district for that purpose. That is enough water to meet the annual residential needs of a population of nearly 300,000 human beings for the express purpose of encouraging the offspring of some 29 steelhead trout to swim toward the ocean—which, by the way, they tend to do anyway. And to add insult to injury, almost all of these smolts will be eaten by predators before they reach the ocean.

So let me put this again and quite bluntly. In order to benefit a handful of steelhead trout, the Bureau sacrificed

enough water to meet the annual needs of a human population of 300,000. At \$700 per acre-foot, the cost of this exercise amounted to \$21 million.

This is the lunacy of the environmental left and the policies they have imposed on our State and our country. It needs to stop now. And to the extent that we can do so through the power of the purse, we must.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this McClintock amendment because it sounds like a solution in search of a problem.

This amendment seeks to undermine the Endangered Species Act by restricting the Bureau of Reclamation from expending funds on water for the purpose of managing endangered fish populations.

While I oppose the spirit of the amendment, I must also object to it because it does absolutely nothing. The Bureau of Reclamation does not purchase water for the purpose of temperature management. The Bureau of Reclamation does not purchase water now, and they have no plans to do it in fiscal year 2016. In fact, due to water scarcity, the price of water is too high.

The extreme drought in the West presents significant management challenges, and Bureau of Reclamation biologists should have every tool possible to make decisions and provide a safety net for species nearing extinction.

Instead of attempting to undermine the judgment of those professionals, we should be working on solutions to grow the water supply in California. That involves water reuse; increased efficiencies, which have already started; conservation; storm water capture; agricultural practices.

The dry West faces very difficult choices, and we want to walk alongside them but with solutions that make sense and that are capable of being implemented.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, perhaps from the damp State of Ohio, this might look like a solution in search of a problem. I would invite the gentlelady to come to California in the midst of this drought to see the devastation it is causing.

The Bureau just released 10 billion gallons for this stated purpose, to adjust river water temperatures and to nudge steelhead trout smolts to the ocean. They weren't coy about it. They were very, very clear. They have been very clear in their budget requests for this practice.

But let me, just for the sake of argument, accept the gentlelady's point that they have no plans to do so. Well, if that is the case, she should have no objections to this measure. The fact is, they not only have plans to do so, but

they have been doing so, and it is devastating what little precious water is remaining behind our precious reservoirs.

We will run out by the end of the summer if these practices continue. And if they continue and if we do, I think that the gentlelady will need to make an apology to the 38 million suffering people of California.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the requirement in section 323.4(a)(1)(ii) of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations, or section 232.3(c)(1)(ii)(A) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, that activities identified in paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (f) of section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A)) must be established or ongoing in order to receive an exemption under such subsection.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. I thank the gentleman from Idaho, Chairman SIMPSON.

Mr. Chair, the House has previously passed language to require the Army Corps of Engineers to apply the Clean Water Act as the Congress has passed it, not as the Corps may wish it to have been written. Unfortunately, the Corps has disregarded these efforts and imposed regulations that could actually prevent farmers from changing crops or fallowing fields during, especially, California's historic drought.

□ 0130

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act exempts from regulation the following: "Normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities such as plowing, seeding, cultivating, minor drainage, harvesting for the production of food, fiber, and forest products, or upland soil and water conservation practices."

No additional requirements are included, and these activities are specifically identified as exempt. However, the Corps and the EPA have used creative interpretations to drastically increase their jurisdiction beyond what Congress has intended.

In fact, the Corps states the following on their Web site:

If a property has been used for cattle grazing, the exemption does not apply if future activities would involve planting crops for food.

An operation is no longer established when the area on which it is conducted has been converted to another use or has lain idle.

Now, under this interpretation, a farmer switching from one crop to another, such as corn or tomatoes, would no longer be engaged in normal activities and could be subject to regulation.

As I mentioned earlier, in this time of record drought in California, a practice such as leaving a field fallow, as is happening now across California due to the historic droughts, means that replanting the following year, if possible, would be seen by the Corps as a new—not existing—activity triggering regulation and permitting requirements. This is not the intention of what Congress had years ago with the Clean Water Act.

This overreach could even prevent farmers from switching to less water-intensive crops, if they saw fit, during California's droughts for fear of an impossible morass of regulatory requirements or, with the involuntary cuts that have been underway, see that they would again be required to have new permits because of this misinterpretation by the Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the House has supported amendments I have sponsored on two other occasions. Language addressing this issue previously passed by voice vote and was included in the CR/Omnibus; yet the Corps has refused to recognize clear congressional intent and abandoned its interpretation.

My amendment, for the third time, will seek to prohibit funding for these creative interpretations. I urge your support of this effort to once again make clear the will of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). This amendment makes a significant change to the Clean Water Act regulations, one we should not be making late at night in an appropriations bill. It deserves thoughtful consideration. I think the gentleman probably would agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, under current law and regulation, activities that convert wetlands that occur as part of existing, ongoing farming, ranching, and silviculture activities do not require a section 404 wetlands permit.

Let me repeat that for my colleagues. The Clean Water Act explicitly exempts certain activities from regulation, and these include normal agricultural activities like plowing fields, planting and harvesting crops, and maintaining irrigation and drainage ditches.

Those exemptions were added by Congress in 1977. The 1977 law created the list of activity-based exemptions from normal farming, ranching, and forestry activities; but it also included safeguards to ensure that these exempted activities were not exploited by large-scale commercial interests. The regulations implementing those exemptions were completed in 1986 during the Reagan administration.

The underlying fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Appropriations bill before us already includes language in section 106 affirming that these activities exempted by Congress 38 years ago continue to be exempt. It clearly states that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to require a permit when these activities are conducted.

The gentleman from California wants to go further than the language already in the bill with his amendment. In his view, wetlands should be able to be filled even when a farm has been converted to another use or farm fields have lain idle so long that modifications to the hydrology are necessary to conduct operations.

I say to my colleague from California, it is hard to understand how any discharge can be normal for an operation that isn't established.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleague why this concerns me. According to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, in my home State, since the late 18th century, 90 percent of Ohio's wetland resources have been destroyed or degraded through draining, filling, or other modification. Because of the valuable functions the remaining wetlands perform, it is imperative to ensure that all impacts to wetlands are properly mitigated.

Wetlands help filter impurities from water. Sediment settles out of runoff, and contaminants bind to plant surfaces in wetlands resulting in improved water quality. Wetlands perform other valuable functions, including reducing flood flow and shoreline erosion control. They are almost like lungs. They are the lungs of the Earth and connect the land to the water.

In Ohio, we also depend upon our wetlands as haven for rare and endangered plants, and one-third of all the endangered species depends on wetlands for survival. Many wetlands are important fish spawning and nursery areas, as well as nesting, resting, and feeding areas for waterfowl.

We should make certain that any changes we make to wetlands policy that may result in the destruction of these remaining very important ecological areas are evaluated carefully and we do not overturn nearly 40 years of policy lightly.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I must respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments by my

colleague from Ohio on that, but in practice in California, they are already moving well beyond established law in the 404 section that would indeed allow for normal activities to be exempted.

I say "normal activities." It is normal for farmers to change crops, to rotate crops as what fits the land, that fits available water supply, that fits what the farmer deems to do with his or her land. There is this thing called property rights in Ohio and California.

It is amazing to me that the Army Corps continues to misinterpret and creatively interpret the 404 exemptions because, in practice in northern California, we have seen that the ability to switch crops, to do as you see fit with your land within the permit, with the exemptions of the 404, are being violated.

We have attempted to work with the Army Corps in northern California on that when I was told recently that they would ignore this section and ignore the efforts we have made previously.

That is why this amendment is necessary, not only to send a message, but to remove the funding that they would try to use to stop the cultural practices of farmers across the country, especially as it seems to be affecting northern California, to do as they see fit within the exemptions that are already in the law, but seemingly outside of what the wishes of the Army Corps are.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the "aye" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to deliver water to the Trinity River above the minimum requirements of the Trinity Record of Decision or to supplement flows in the Klamath River.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 223, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, as was discussed earlier, California is seeing the most severe drought in many, many years. Our own Governor has recently ordered a mandatory 25 percent water rationing across the State.

Despite these dire conditions which have idled hundreds of thousands of productive farmland and caused billions of dollars in economic damage, the Bureau of Reclamation has unnecessarily diverted water from the Central Valley Project which serves the entire State, 20 million or more people, to salmon habitat in the Klamath River. I say “unnecessarily” because the chinook salmon of the Klamath River are not threatened or endangered and have, in fact, been returning in near record numbers.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau has misused over 100,000 acre feet of water over the last 2 years, which will be enough for up to 800,000 people or even 30,000 acres of cropland.

What is more, stakeholders have already reached an agreement. All the stakeholders in the area have a previous agreement to ensure enough water for both humans and for salmon, according to the Trinity Record of Decision.

□ 0140

The Bureau's actions go above and beyond the requirements of the agreement and negatively impact the very stakeholders that agreed to it, including my constituents.

Two years ago, a bipartisan group from this Congress sent a letter urging the Bureau of Reclamation not to carry out this activity. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply prohibits the Bureau of Reclamation from releasing water beyond the record of decision it is a party to and ensures that cities and farms have access to as much water as possible, especially during this acute drought period. It also maintains the river flows that stakeholders have agreed to and forces the Bureau of Reclamation to keep its promises to the people of California.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment but, believe me, with sympathy toward what the people of the West are facing. I just hope that we can get through this situation reasonably and seamlessly somehow. I oppose the amendment because it would lock in a specific operating regime, regardless of facts on the ground.

In 2014, the Bureau of Reclamation made the decision not to release water above the minimum requirement, clearly showing they are realistic and willing to change to meet the circumstances at hand. I hope the gentleman agrees. Reclamation monitored temperatures and fish health to balance risks.

Then last September, the Bureau of Reclamation did release flows because of a deadly detection of a parasite impacting salmon. Yet we must ensure that the massive fish kill of 2002 doesn't happen again. This balancing act is really difficult, but we cannot

sacrifice the environment either. We must find a way to balance the needs of people and the environment in the West.

Further, in the Klamath Basin, we must meet our obligations to the tribes who have relied on the river. None of this will be easy. We should not be locking in an operating regime that ignores science and does not allow us to adapt to changing circumstances.

On this basis, I oppose the gentleman's amendment and honestly hope, as a country, we can do what is necessary to help the West.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, well, I appreciate that sentiment on helping the West. Perhaps a pipeline from Ohio with all that excess water during flood flows would help us out. But short of doing that right now, indeed, coming back to what is happening with the fish we are speaking of in these systems, the salmon in the Klamath River that we are speaking of are not in danger and are near record numbers in that leg.

This amendment will assist actually downstream on the Sacramento River the endangered winter-run chinook with this additional flow. So even though there may have been detected a parasite, it is not affecting natively what we are talking about here.

And this goes beyond the Record of Decision with agreed water flow amounts of the stakeholders involved. So this is more by whim of BOR once again deciding that additional flows, based on no science beyond the Record of Decision, are taking valuable water away, and it could happen again in this record drought year.

We need not lose the opportunity to have these waters, or other ones talked about earlier tonight, based on the whim of a bureaucracy somewhere that really doesn't seem to be paying attention to the needs of California's farms, cities, and that the water is actually being used to the best benefit of the fish being debated in any one of these systems. So diverting more water away from this is not productive. It doesn't fulfill any scientific goals.

With that, I ask the “aye” votes of this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, before I make a motion, let me thank you for your excellent stewardship of this bill through general order, through the amendment debate in the wee hours of

the morning. We all appreciate it. It has been fair and helped move it along in an orderly manner.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HONORING THE ARKANSAS TOWNS OF MAYFLOWER AND VILONIA

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, April 27, marked the 1-year anniversary of the devastation that occurred when a tornado struck the Mayflower, Vilonia, and Paron communities in Arkansas, destroying more than 400 homes and costing 16 people their lives. The theme of this year's anniversary is, “Remember our loss, celebrate our recovery.”

I have had the opportunity to visit with folks in these communities and to hear their stories of courage and resilience. While I mourn those that are lost, I am thankful for the health and safety of Martin and Kristin Patton and the miraculous survival of their family. Their home literally disintegrated around them.

I am thankful for the leadership of Vilonia Mayor James Firestone and Mayflower Mayor Randy Holland who, along with county and local leaders, are charting a course toward the future. In the face of this tragedy, they furnish us with an inspirational model of solidarity and hope.

I applaud the recovery efforts and dedication of these great Arkansas communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Paron Community in Pulaski County and the Faulkner County towns of Vilonia and Mayflower, Arkansas have experienced tragedy and disaster over these past years, but their resilience and determination to rebuild and recover has never been more prevalent.

Four years ago, on April 25, 2011, an EF2 tornado struck Vilonia, killing four of its 4,000 citizens.

Not two years after that, on March 29, 2013, the residents of Mayflower were left reeling after being flooded with 5,000 barrels of heavy crude oil that erupted from the burst Pegasus Pipeline.

The ability to bounce back after such misfortune is a testament to the great determination and toughness of the townspeople of Vilonia and Mayflower.

And that ability was put to yet another test when, on April 27, 2014, the Mayflower,

Vilonia, and Paron communities were struck by a monster of a tornado.

That tornado was classified as an EF4 with reported winds approaching 200 miles per hour. The half-mile wide twister left a swath of destruction that stretched for over forty miles. In fifty-six minutes, more than 400 homes were destroyed and sixteen people lost their lives. The National Weather Service stated that this was the single deadliest tornado to hit the state of Arkansas since 1968—nearly fifty years earlier.

This past Monday, April 27, marked the one-year anniversary of the devastation wrecked during this horrific storm. The theme of this year's anniversary is, "Remember our loss; celebrate our recovery."

Over the past few weeks, I have had the opportunity to visit with folks from Mayflower and Vilonia and to hear their stories of courage and resilience.

While I mourn those lost in the April 2014 tornados, I am thankful for the health and safety of Martin and Kristin Patton and the miraculous survival of their family. Their home literally completely disintegrated around them and I certainly join them in counting their blessings of moving into their new home last weekend, 364 days after that frightening evening.

I am thankful of the leadership of Vilonia Mayor James Firestone on the job for six and one half years; four of them in a "recovery mode." I am grateful for his leadership with that of the city council in carefully charting a course toward the future.

I am thankful for Mayflower Mayor Randy Holland, who, with county and local leaders, is crafting new economic development directions for this growing community.

In the face of tragedy, they, along with all those who selflessly provided financial support and thousands of volunteer hours, furnish us with an inspirational model of solidarity and hope.

As these brave communities continue to recover and rebuild, I applaud them for their dedication to their neighbors, economy, and community.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE UNDERLYING OBJECTIVES OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-30)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

My Administration fully supports the underlying objectives of the recommendations that the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (the "Commission") offered in January. These recommendations represent an important step forward in protecting the long-term viability of the All-Volunteer Force, improving quality-of-life for service members and their families, and ensuring the fiscal sustainability of the military compensation and retirement systems.

As I directed in my letter of March 30, my team has worked with the Commission to further analyze the recommendations and identify areas of agreement. At this time I am prepared to support specific proposals for 10 of the Commission's 15 recommendations, either as proposed or with modifications that have been discussed among the Department of Defense, other agencies, and the Commission. These include the following:

Survivor Benefit Plan
Financial Education
Medical Personnel Readiness
Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Collaboration
Child Care
Service Member Education
Transition Assistance
Nutritional Financial Assistance
Dependent Space-Available Travel
Report on Military Connected Dependents

In some instances, the Department of Defense is already taking actions to implement these recommendations, and I will direct the Department to develop plans to complete this implementation. In those areas where legislation is required, I expect the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the Congress on my behalf the relevant legislative proposals, which I recommend be enacted without delay.

With respect to the remaining recommendations, given their complexity and our solemn responsibility to ensure that any changes further the objectives above, we will continue working with the Commission to understand how the following proposals would affect the All-Volunteer Force:

Blended Retirement System
Reserve Component Duty Statuses
Exceptional Family Member's Support

Commissary and Exchange Consolidation

I believe there is merit in all of these recommendations and that they deserve careful consideration and study. I will ensure that the Congress is kept apprised of this ongoing work.

Finally, I agree with the Commission that we need to continue to improve the military health care system. The health care reforms proposed in my Fiscal Year 2016 Budget are a good first step and offer service members, retirees, and their families more control and choice over their health care decisions. This remains a critical issue, and my Administration will work with the Commission and interested Members of Congress in the coming months to develop additional reform proposals for consideration as part of my Fiscal Year 2017 Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 2015.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today after 4 p.m. and

May 1 on account of attending the promotion ceremony of her son Raymond Wagner, III to Captain in the United States Army.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.) the House adjourned until today, Friday, May 1, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1318. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0248; FRL-9926-24] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1319. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Phenol, 2-(2H-benzotriazol-2-yl)-6-dodecyl-4-methyl-; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0418; FRL-9925-78] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1320. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Arkansas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Fee Regulations [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0054; FRL-9926-91-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1321. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0969; FRL-9926-81-Region 5] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1322. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Mexico, and the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incinerator Units [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0763; FRL-9927-00-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1323. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Stage I Regulations [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0846; FRL-9927-10-Region 6] received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1324. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — General Permits and Permits by Rule for the Federal Minor New Source Review Program in Indian Country for Five Source Categories [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0151; FRL-9919-85-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ95) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1325. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Energy Labeling Rule (RIN: 3084-AB03) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1326. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Authority of DOE Protective Force Officers That Are Federal Employees To Make Arrests Without a Warrant for Certain Crimes (RIN: 1994-AA03) received April 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1327. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Vermilion Snapper [Docket No.: 130312235-3658-02] (RIN: 0648-XD734) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1328. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD844) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1329. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 32 [Docket No.: 140501394-5279-02] (RIN: 0648-BE20) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1330. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD874) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1331. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Rationalization Program [Docket No.: 101214615-5254-02] (RIN: 0648-BA61) received April 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1332. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Dela-

ware River; Marcus Hook, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0129] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1333. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Charleston Race Week, Charleston Harbor; Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0018] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1334. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Vessel Fire and Escort, Port of New York, NJ, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0189] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1335. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electrical Equipment in Hazardous Locations [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0850] (RIN: 1625-AC00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1336. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Ontonagon River, Ontonagon, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0082] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1337. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Hoquiam River, Hoquiam, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1029] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1338. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Tesoro Terminal Protest; Port of Long Beach Harbor; Pacific Ocean, California [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0163] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1339. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Naval Helicopter Association (NHA) Red Bull Helicopter Demonstration; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0137] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1340. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Sellwood Bridge Construction, Willamette River, Portland, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0187] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1341. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Marina del Rey Fireworks Show, Santa Monica Bay; Marina del Rey, California [Docket No.:

USCG-2015-0155] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1342. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and Museum Fireworks Display; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0186] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1343. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Naval Helicopter Association (NHA) Red Bull Helicopter Demonstration; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0137] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1344. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Barge-based Fireworks, Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0213] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1345. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Eastern Branch Elizabeth River; Norfolk, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0202] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1346. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections to 38 CFR Part 3 (RIN: 2900-AP33) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1347. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updating Certain Delegations of Authority in VA Medical Regulations (RIN: 2900-AP17) received April 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. House Joint Resolution 43. Resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (Rept. 114-99). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JONES, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr.

BUCHSON, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 2123. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish non-formulary drugs and medicines to veterans diagnosed with mental health disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2124. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 2125. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to revise its sponsorship identification rules so as to require the disclosure of the names of significant donors to persons paying for or furnishing broadcast matter or origination cablecasting matter that is political matter or matter involving the discussion of a controversial issue of public importance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2126. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from replacing ICD-9 with ICD-10 in implementing the HIPAA code set standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. KATKO, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 2127. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to limit access to expedited airport security screening at an airport security checkpoint to participants of the PreCheck program and other known low-risk passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. REED, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain stock of real estate investment trusts from the tax on foreign investments in United States real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2129. A bill to strengthen the disclosure requirements for creditors under the Truth in Lending Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 2130. A bill to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 2131. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. DOLD, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2132. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency retrofit pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SIREs, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide additional training opportunities under the Transition Assistance Program to members of the Armed Forces who are being separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require review of the economic cost of adding a species to the list of endangered species or threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide certain individuals with information on employment support services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 2136. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for quality reviews of benefit decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 2137. A bill to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 2138. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment under part A of the Medicare Program on a reasonable cost basis for anesthesia services furnished by an anesthesiologist in certain rural hospitals in the same manner as payments are provided for anesthesia services furnished by anesthesiologist assistants and certified registered nurse anesthetists in such hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUSH, Mr.

JONES, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2139. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide notice of average times for processing claims and percentage of claims approved, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 2140. A bill to promote freedom, human rights, and the rule of law as part of United States-Vietnam relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. HUIZENG of Michigan):

H.R. 2141. A bill to require consultation with Congress, insurers, and consumers with respect to domestic insurance and international insurance standards, regulations, or frameworks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2142. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for facilities using a qualified methane conversion technology to provide transportation fuels and chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2144. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish entities tasked with improving program and project management in Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2145. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans program to seek to employ physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs on a without compensation basis in practice areas and specialties with staffing shortages and long appointment waiting times; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2147. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding featuring the likeness of a woman on the twenty dollar bill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to require a substance abuse risk assessment and targeted drug testing as a condition for the receipt of unemployment benefits, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 2149. A bill to establish a grant program to ensure that students in high-need schools have equal access to a quality education delivered by an effective, diverse workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BASS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-

ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SPIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2150. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2151. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the calculation, oversight, and accountability of non-DSH supplemental payments under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 2152. A bill to ban meat and poultry products processed in China from school lunches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2153. A bill to reclassify certain low-level felonies as misdemeanors, to eliminate the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to reinvest in our communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reduce injuries and deaths caused by cell phone use and texting while driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FUDGE:

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BOST, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 2156. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the practices of recovery audit contractors under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year tax-free distributions from individual retirement plans for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the

credit for energy-efficient existing homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for one year the credit for energy-efficient new homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the employer wage credit for employees who are active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the enhanced charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the deduction for mortgage insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2164. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the 15-year straight-line cost recovery for qualified leasehold improvements, qualified restaurant buildings and improvements, and qualified retail improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2165. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the above-the-line deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2166. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 2167. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans, to help restore natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources of the United States, to train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, to promote the value of public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. SCHRAEDER):

H.R. 2168. A bill to make the current Dungeness crab fishery management regime permanent and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2169. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to require the President to transmit the annual budget of the Social Security Administration without revisions to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2170. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23rd Headquarters Special

Troops, known as the "Ghost Army", collectively, in recognition of its unique and incredible service during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2171. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Pole Creek Wilderness, the Owyhee River Wilderness, and the North Fork Owyhee Wilderness and to authorize the continued use of motorized vehicles for livestock monitoring, herding, and grazing in certain wilderness areas in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 2172. A bill to establish a pilot toll credit market place program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2173. A bill to require States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2174. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2175. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to ensure oversight and cost savings in the pricing and contracting of prescription drug benefits under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2176. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2177. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, Financial Services, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2178. A bill to restore employment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from timber sales conducted on National Forest System land, to reduce payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 to reflect such counties' receipt of timber sale revenues, to strengthen stewardship end result contracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception from the passive loss rules for investments in high technology research small business pass-thru entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2180. A bill to authorize grantees of Department of Justice grants to set up task forces on policing in local communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 2181. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize certain aliens who have earned a Ph.D. degree from a United States institution of higher education in a field of science, technology, engineering, or mathematics to be admitted for permanent residence and to be exempted from the numerical limitations on H-1B non-immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2182. A bill to deregulate interstate commerce with respect to parimutuel wagering on horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2183. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to consider Brunswick County, North Carolina, to be part of the same metropolitan statistical area as Wilmington, North Carolina; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the phasedown of the credit percentage for the dependent care tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2185. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from using extraordinary measures to prevent the Government from reaching the statutory debt limit, or using extraordinary measures once such limit has been reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 2186. A bill to establish a pilot grant program to support career and technical education exploration programs in middle schools and high schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 2187. A bill to direct the Securities Exchange Commission to revise its regulations regarding the qualifications of natural persons as accredited investors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 2188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance to eligible nonprofit organizations to provide specialized housing and supportive services for elderly persons who are the primary caregivers of children that are related to such persons; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 2189. A bill to direct the President to submit to Congress a report on fugitives currently residing in other countries whose extradition is sought by the United States and related matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2190. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve procedures for legal justice for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs.

BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DOLD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LEE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2192. A bill to improve the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating

to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 2194. A bill to reauthorize the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal years 2016 through 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 236. A resolution expressing condolences to the family of Dr. Warren Weinstein, and commemorating the life and work of Dr. Warren Weinstein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 237. A resolution declaring that achieving the primary goal of the National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease of the Department of Health and Human Services to prevent and effectively treat Alzheimer's disease by 2025 is an urgent national priority; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. LEE):

H. Res. 238. A resolution promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2015, which includes bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations of the United States such as American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 239. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to childhood stroke and recognizing May 2015 as "National Pediatric Stroke Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COSTA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 240. A resolution recognizing the economic, cultural, and political contributions of the Southeast Asian American community at this time of the 40th anniversary of the Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide, and the end of the Vietnam War and Secret War in Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KEATING, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 241. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 2015 as "Alcohol Re-

sponsibility Month" and supporting the goals and ideals of responsible decisions regarding alcohol; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 242. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week, the week of May 3 through 9, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 2125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 2127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises."

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 2131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 2133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 2134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 2139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 2141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and within the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 2143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congressional power to provide for public financing of presidential campaigns arises under the General Welfare Clause, Art. I, Sec. 8, of the U. S. Constitution.

In *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 91 (1976), the Supreme Court upheld the congressional power to enact public financing of presidential elections under this Clause. The Supreme Court stated with regard to the provisions in the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 establishing a presidential public financing system, "In this case, Congress was legislating for the 'general welfare'—to reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising."

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 2144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 2146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 2147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 6, Congress has the authority to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 2148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 2151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 2156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare) and Clause 3 (Commerce) "Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare"

"Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate Commerce"

The Medicare Audit Improvement Act makes several changes to the way hospital audits are conducted which involves at least three parties: a hospital, a private Medicare contractor who conducts audits and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services. During the auditing process, transactions take place between these parties which is what constitutes this bill as regulating commerce. Further, Medicare is considered to be constitutional as part of providing for the general welfare and therefore any changes to Medicare would fall under this provision as well.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2161.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2162.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2163.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 2166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 2168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 2169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 2170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2172.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, which allows Congress to regulate Commerce among the several States

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 2173.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 2174.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 2175.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2176.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2177.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, . . .

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the US Constitution: The Congress shall have power to borrow Money on the credit of the United States; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution. The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 2184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 2185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . pay the Debts"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . borrow Money on the credit of the United States;"

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 2186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 2187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties,

Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States . . .

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 156: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 213: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 232: Mr. YOHIO and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 251: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 292: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 329: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 335: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 358: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 359: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 379: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 402: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 465: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. REED, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 511: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 535: Mr. COFFMAN, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 539: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SIREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 540: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 546: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 563: Mrs. CAPP and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 578: Mr. BUCK and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 592: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 606: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 609: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 616: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 619: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 624: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 625: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 649: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 672: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 702: Mr. COLE and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 727: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 738: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 767: Mr. COLE and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 774: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 784: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 789: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 793: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 799: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 842: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. GRANGER, and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 868: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 879: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 881: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 902: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 911: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 915: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 921: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DENT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. MARINO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 939: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 952: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 980: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 985: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 989: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1060: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1062: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1089: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1094: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1174: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1188: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1192: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HARPER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1203: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1220: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HARDY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1250: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1258: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1266: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1282: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1299: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 1300: Mr. ISSA and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1308: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1310: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1323: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 1331: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1356: Mr. POLIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1364: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1375: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1384: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1399: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1414: Mr. DELANEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1439: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 1462: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1464: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1475: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1476: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1503: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1519: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1555: Mrs. LUMMIS and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1559: Mr. KIND, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1567: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1571: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1598: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1599: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1600: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1602: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 1608: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1610: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 1624: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1633: Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1634: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1635: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1664: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1666: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1674: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1713: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1714: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1718: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1728: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1734: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1736: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1737: Mr. TURNER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 1739: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1752: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1768: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1769: Mr. COOK and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1786: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1795: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1801: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1814: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1818: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1853: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1859: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1901: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1908: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEWIS, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1924: Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 1937: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1956: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLÁN.
H.R. 1957: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLÁN.
H.R. 1958: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLÁN.
H.R. 1959: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SABLÁN.
H.R. 1960: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1961: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1994: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2006: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2007: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2025: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2031: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 2033: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2068: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2109: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2121: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.J. Res. 22: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.J. Res. 43: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.J. Res. 44: Mr. HILL.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HILL, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. RUSSELL.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. ZINKE.
H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 14: Ms. GRAHAM.
H. Res. 54: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H. Res. 56: Mr. TROTT and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 110: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H. Res. 112: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 181: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 186: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 203: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 216: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 224: Mr. STEWART and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 226: Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 235: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of April 29, 2015]

OFFERED BY MS. DONNA F. EDWARDS

The amendment to be offered by Representative Donna F. Edwards or a designee to H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. DENT

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Standards Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits" and identified by regulation identification number 1904-AC87.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 25: Page 29, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$125,000,000)".

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$105,000,000)".

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to expand plutonium pit production capacity at the PF-4 facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. ELLISON

AMENDMENT NO. 27: Page 22, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$45,000,000)".

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$45,000,000)".

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MS. TITUS

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 25, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$150,000,000)".

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$150,000,000)".

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and

Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MR. QUIGLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 30: Page 29, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$167,050,000)”.

Page 57, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$167,050,000)”.

H.R. 2028

OFFERED BY: MS. DELBENE

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are procured from a manufacturer that is part of the national technology and industrial base.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2015

No. 64

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Peter Milner, chaplain of the North Carolina Senate in Raleigh, NC.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Heavenly Father, You have been our dwelling place for all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, You were God. So we bow our heads and our hearts before You, and we seek Your guidance as a nation. We are crippled without Your help and helpless without Your steadfast love. Come to our assistance. Make haste to help us. Forgive us of our sin, O Lord, and wipe away the tears from our eyes.

We are so grateful for this day. We come boldly to Your throne of grace, and we bring our weaknesses, we bring our doubts and our requests, and we submit our pleas before You, a holy and a good God. Have compassion on the lonely, and grant peace to the brokenhearted.

Hear all these prayers, O Lord, and bless all of those Members assembled here. Pour out the oil of Your gladness down upon this Nation, upon these proceedings, upon this government, and towards every one of these hard-working representatives of Your people.

It is in Jesus's Name we pray. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The Senator from North Carolina.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to welcome to this body a friend and a fellow North Carolinian, Peter Milner. Chaplain Milner serves the North Carolina General Assembly as the State's senate chaplain.

A fellow Demon Deacon and an alumna of Wake Forest, he received his undergraduate degree in sociology and religion. While at Wake Forest, Chaplain Milner was instrumental in the creation of the Wake Forest Volunteer Service Corps, which engages hundreds of students, faculty, and staff to participate in community-based organizations.

After completing his undergraduate work at Wake Forest, he went on to earn his master's in secondary social studies education to become a high school teacher. Called to the ministry after his first year of teaching, he attended Duke Divinity School, where he thrived in his role as resident coordinator of Emmaus House in Raleigh, which provides safe, affordable housing for working homeless men recovering from substance dependency. Chaplain Milner's devotion to and passion for helping the homeless is unwavering and very clear. I saw it for myself when I first met Peter a few years ago at a homeless center in Raleigh, NC.

Besides his tireless work on behalf of the homeless, Chaplain Milner has been instrumental in improving the lives of students, medical patients, and—a cause very important to North Carolinians, including me—our Nation's veterans. Because of his work as an outreach specialist for veterans at StepUp Ministry, Chaplain Milner established an important link between veterans in need and the business community. His hard work continues to help struggling veterans achieve stable lives through employment counseling and life skills training.

The North Carolina General Assembly is blessed to have a man who has

devoted his life to causes much larger than himself. But of all that he has accomplished in life so far, he says his greatest accomplishment is being a husband to his bride of 13 years, Anna, and a father to their two beautiful children, Silas and Josie, who are all with us today.

Chaplain Milner, I thank you for leading our Chamber in prayer today, and I welcome you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I thank Chaplain Milner for being here.

I want to talk about a friend. He is somebody who blessed our legislature during the time I was speaker of the house.

I will not repeat all of the things Peter has done for the community. I want to speak specifically about what he has done for the State chamber and the general assembly, the part where I was speaker. He was a calm presence in an otherwise chaotic environment called the legislative body—not unlike the one we have here. He is always somebody you can look to for guidance, support, and for inspiration, and for that, I thank him.

I will also say—you notice he is a little bit tall. He played basketball at Wake.

We have this rivalry with South Carolina. We play basketball every year. We get together and we either travel down to South Carolina or the legislature comes here. I played on that basketball team for 4 years. In each of those 4 years, we were hopeful that Peter would play with us, but for some reason he didn't. Now, the only thing that I see differently—he is playing this year, since my departure.

I hope your decision to play isn't because of my exit, Peter.

I thank you for being here and for your contribution to the community. I welcome your family, who I believe is in the Chamber today. I hope you enjoy today.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2543

On behalf of all Members who benefit from your guidance and your spiritual presence and guidance in the State of North Carolina and the general assembly, thank you, and welcome.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

PACQUIAO-MAYWEATHER FIGHT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as some know, I fought a little bit. I was in the minor leagues for a couple of years.

As the Presiding Officer knows, in Nevada, on Saturday night, in Las Vegas, there is going to be a stunning athletic event, one of the most significant athletic events, actually, in the last 50 years. It is a wonderful occasion for Nevada to host the fight between Manny Pacquiao—I should say Congressman Pacquiao, who is a member of the Philippine Congress—and Floyd Mayweather. They will be battling for three separate titles. They are fighting for the 147-pound weight class—for all the people who think that is small, that is the class that—we have had some of our great fighters of all time who have fought that same weight level.

These are two great athletes. The winner of the match will be crowned as the greatest pound for pound fighter in the world, and they will go down as two of the finest fighters ever in the history of the world. So regardless of who wins, this bout is projected to shatter boxing records for not only being a significant boxing match—the focus of the world will be on this fight. People all over the world will be watching this fight.

They don't really know how many pay-per-view purchases are expected, but I made one last night. I was planning on going to the fight, but, as my friend the Presiding Officer knows, things have changed over the years. If we want to get one of those good seats, we have to pay for it. I have been willing to do that in the past, but the traffic was a little too heavy there, so I decided to watch it here with some of my family. But I am so happy that the pay-per-view purchases are expected to exceed 3 million people, and they won't get it any cheaper than I did—\$99.95. So it is wonderful that all previous records will be broken as to revenue.

The only thing I don't like about it is the fight doesn't start back here until 9 o'clock and usually they don't end until midnight. I wish they would start a little earlier, but, as I have learned with my baseball, they just start them later back here.

I am very excited about this unforgettable fight. There is nothing like a championship fight. There is nothing like one that has all this attention.

After I started practicing law, I started judging fights. I was on the Nevada fight commission, and I judged

fights. I judged lots of fights. I can remember the first big fight I went to. Oh, it was a big fight. I walked in there, and I couldn't imagine there would be that much attention on anything. Of course, there were thousands of people there. I was excited. I was going to judge one of the preliminary fights. It was stunning. You see ring-side all of these glamorous, important people. These fights catch the enthusiasm of sports fans all over the world.

The eagerness that I have of watching this fight goes far beyond the sport of boxing or the spectacle of a marquis matchup. I am thrilled for Nevada. This fight will inject hundreds of millions of dollars into the State's economy. It will benefit Nevadans—all fighters and their teams, of course, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, limousine drivers, parking valets, maids will get bigger tips than they usually get. It will be a great time for Nevada.

So I have done everything I can with in my power here as a Member of the legislature to help in any way that I can. I have interceded on a couple of occasions to help make this fight move forward, and I was very happy to do so.

I love this sport. Some of my most prized possessions in my home are fight pictures. I have one picture of the great Joe Louis and Max Schmeling, and they both signed that picture before they died. I had the good fortune, when Joe Louis spent so much time at Caesars Palace, to have met him. I have pictures hanging on my wall of my dear father-in-law, who worked with fighters. I have a picture on the wall—they are all together—of him with Jack Dempsey, with Primo Carnera, who was 6 foot 7, a huge man—my father-in-law was about 5 foot 5—Sugar Ray Robinson. All these—not all of them, but many great fighters are there with my father-in-law. I love that picture, and it reminds me of my minor league experience in boxing.

I am very excited about watching this fight.

Las Vegas has been the entertainment capital of the world for a long time, and we are happy that, in fact, is the case. But a few short years ago, as the Presiding Officer knows, we were hit very hard. The debacle that took place on Wall Street hurt Nevada more than any other place. We have been recovering. We haven't recovered totally, but we have recovered significantly.

The 2008 economic collapse took a heavy toll on Nevada. A quarter of Nevadans are employed in the tourism and hospitality industry, and when the recession hit, they got hurt, as did all working classes—construction workers; everybody got hurt—but we fought our way back.

Last year, we welcomed to Las Vegas 41 million people—little Las Vegas, 41 million people. It is not so little, but the Presiding Officer and I remember when it was a little place. But now it is a community with a metropolitan area of over 2 million people. Forty-one mil-

lion people have come to Las Vegas and produced an economic impact of more than \$50 billion. We shattered previous records by attracting 1.4 million more visitors than we did—in 2014. So it is only going to get better, and the Pacquiao-Mayweather fight will keep that momentum going for Nevada.

I am not picking a winner. I wish both men the best of luck. But, admittedly, I am a little biased because of my relationship with Manny Pacquiao.

As the Presiding Officer will remember, one of my real campaigners in one of my difficult races was Manny Pacquiao. He campaigned for me. He broke training to come out of L.A., flew in for a big event I had one night. So you have to remember that kind of stuff. So I have a very good relationship with Manny Pacquiao. Certainly, I don't have a bad one with Floyd Mayweather, but I know Manny Pacquiao much better than I know Floyd Mayweather. He stood in my corner in the past, and he will always have my support.

Regardless, though, of which fighter reigns supreme on that Saturday night—and one of them will. They are alone. Nobody is there with them. Regardless of who leaves the arena with that big belt, Nevada's hard-working economy will have won the fight.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate will soon resume consideration of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I expect we will consider several amendments today, and I continue to encourage Senators to come to the floor and offer them.

The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is bipartisan legislation that will ensure that Congress and the American people have a chance to review any comprehensive agreement reached with Iran, and it ensures they will be able to do so before congressional sanctions are lifted.

Here is why that is critical. First, these sanctions are a big reason why America was able even to bring Iran to the table in the first place. We shouldn't be giving up that leverage now without the American people, through the Members of Congress they elect, having a chance to weigh in. Quite simply, the American people expect us to have an opportunity to evaluate this agreement or not.

Second, Iran wouldn't just use the funds derived from sanctions relief to rebuild its economy. It is certain to use that money to fund proxy forces such as Hezbollah and to prop up the Assad regime. What is clear is that Iran is determined to use every tool—to use every tool—at its disposal to expand

aggressively its sphere of influence across the greater Middle East.

The regime's belligerent behavior in the Strait of Hormuz was just another reminder of that fact. But it reminds us of something else, too—our need to invest in the naval and seaborne expeditionary capabilities in the Persian Gulf, which will be necessary not just to retain dominance at sea but to contain Iran's military and irregular forces, as well.

Today, though—today—we are focused on one point above all else—that the American people and Congress deserve a say before any congressional sanctions are lifted. At the very least, sanctions should not be lifted before the Iranians fully disclose all aspects of research and development as it relates to the potential military dimensions of their nuclear program. Yet the interim agreement, as it has been explained to Congress, would bestow international recognition to Iran's research and development program, along with an international blessing for Iran to become a nuclear threshold state poised at the edge of developing a nuclear weapon. It is frightening to think what Iran might be able to achieve covertly in that context.

Now, to a lot of Americans this all sounds quite different from what they were led to believe a deal with Iran would actually be about—preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons and dismantling Iran's enrichment capability. But that apparently has already been given away. So the American people deserve a say through their Members of Congress. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act will ensure Congress gets a vote either to approve or disapprove of the comprehensive agreement.

Just as President Obama's successor will need to modernize our military to deal with the challenges posed by Iran's aggression, so will the President's successor want to consider Congress's view of any comprehensive deal. A failed resolution of approval, as the bill before us would permit, would send an unmistakable signal about congressional opposition to lifting sanctions. Let me say that again. A failed resolution of approval, permitted under this bill, would send an unmistakable signal about congressional opposition to lifting sanctions.

So now is the time for Congress to invest in the capabilities President Obama's successor may need to use to end Iran's nuclear weapons program if the Iranians covertly pursue a weapon or violate the terms of the ultimate agreement. And now is the time for Congress to pass the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

THE BUDGET

Mr. McCONNELL. Now, on a different matter, Mr. President, I was glad to see yesterday's announcement of a budget conference agreement. That means Congress is now one step closer

to passing a balanced budget that supports a healthy economy, funds national defense, strengthens Medicare, and begins to tackle our debt problems without taking more money from hard-working Americans.

It is a balanced budget that could help lead to more than 1 million additional jobs and boost our economy by nearly half a trillion dollars, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. In short, it is a balanced budget that is all about the future. That is also why it provides a tool for the Senate majority to repeal a failed policy of the past—ObamaCare—so we can start over with real patient-centered health reform.

This is a good balanced budget every Senator should want to support, and I look forward to the Senate taking up the budget agreement next week.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1191, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1140, in the nature of a substitute.

Corker/Cardin amendment No. 1179 (to amendment No. 1140), to require submission of all Persian text included in the agreement.

Blunt amendment No. 1155 (to amendment No. 1140), to extend the requirement for annual Department of Defense reports on the military power of Iran.

Vitter modified amendment No. 1186 (to amendment No. 1179), to require an assessment of inadequacies in the international monitoring and verification system as they relate to a nuclear agreement with Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 1149 to declare that any agreement reached by the President relating to the nuclear program of Iran is a congressional-executive agreement to be considered under the expedited procedure in both Houses of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARDIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, we have been proceeding now for about a week. We have had a good debate on issues. Many Members are working with Senator

CORKER and me to clear their amendments so they are consistent with the overall objective that was supported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a 19-to-0 vote, and we are going to continue to work on that process in the orderly consideration of amendments.

For that reason, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Perhaps if the Senator from Maryland will listen to my explanation of what this amendment does, he will withdraw his objection.

During our debate on Tuesday, when I offered an amendment to deem the agreement between Iran and America—well, actually and the world—a treaty subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, the Senator from Maryland spoke about one of the objections to the treaty. He said:

Secondly, I don't know how we are going to explain it to our colleagues in the House of Representatives. The Presiding Officer served in the House. I served in the House. Senator Menendez served in the House. The last time I checked, we imposed these sanctions because the bill passed both the Senate and the House, and now we are saying that the approval process is going to ignore the House of Representatives, solely going to be a matter for the U.S. Senate on a ratification of a treaty? That does not seem like a workable solution.

Now, Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Maryland did not object to my raising my first amendment to deem it a treaty. And of course this body then voted on that, and I appreciate that fact. And I accept the verdict of this Chamber that they did not want to deem this agreement a treaty—fair enough.

But I would like to quote, in addition to the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Tennessee in arguing against deeming this a treaty. The Senator from Tennessee said: "We think the President has the ability to negotiate things."

Well, first off all, I agree with that. Article II, section 2 states: "He [The President] shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur."

So that actually is the constitutional method for making agreements between nations—having the President negotiate that. I completely agree. We can't have 535 negotiators. But we certainly should have this body involved in those agreements. We should have a role. We should have a robust role. And, of course, I believe it is so important, that this has such an effect and that it risks so much for this Nation, that I believe it should be a treaty. But again, fair enough—this body deemed it would not be a treaty. The Senator from Tennessee went on to say:

We had no idea this President would consider suspending these sanctions ad infinitum, forever—no idea. I think even people on the other side of the aisle were shocked.

We were shocked. Yes, we granted those waivers for national security. We did not believe those waivers would be abused the way they are being abused right now.

The Senator from Tennessee also went on to say: "This is one of the biggest geopolitical issues that will potentially happen if an agreement is reached in our lifetime here in the Senate."

Once again, I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. This is a huge geopolitical issue. And right now this administration deems that agreement on its own authority, an executive agreement, and really, at this point in time, we have no role. There is no involvement. The Senator from Tennessee went on to say: "Look, I have strong agreement with the sentiment of our Senator from Wisconsin." Again, he is agreeing with the fact that this really should rise to the level of a treaty.

He also went on to say: "Without the bill that is on the floor, the American people will never see it."

Think of that. Think of an agreement between Iran, as it is being described—and, as I say, nobody really knows yet, but what I believe is being described to us—puts Iran on a path for a nuclear weapon. How many years has it been that Presidents from both parties and Members of Congress from both parties have stood and said very forcefully that we simply cannot allow Iran to have a nuclear weapon? Now we may be facing an agreement between this country, other nations of the world, and Iran that actually puts Iran on a path for a nuclear agreement.

The Senator from Tennessee is correct. I hope he is not correct, but I think he may be correct that right now this President has no duty to bring that agreement to the American people. I do happen to believe that public pressure would be so great that the American people would not tolerate that level of brazenness, that level of arrogance on the part of any administration or any President to do a deal, to make an agreement of such import that before implementing that agreement the President of the United States would not bring that agreement to the American people and subject it to, in some shape or form, the advice and consent of either this Chamber or Congress as a whole.

The final quote from the Senator from Tennessee is this. He said:

Now, look, if I could wave a magic wand or all of a sudden donkeys flew around the Capitol, I would love for us to have the ability to deem this a treaty. I really would.

Well, if the agreement that President Obama is talking about in its current framework is agreed to between this administration and the other negotiating partners and Iran, we better all hope that donkeys start flying around the Capitol, because that agreement, as it is being described to us, would put Iran on the path to be a nuclear power. That would destabilize not only the region, but it would destabilize the

world. It would lead to an enormous amount of nuclear proliferation within the region. It is a very bad deal. It is very risky for this Nation. It affects this Nation.

Let me just go through the three forms of international agreements. There are no set criteria in terms of what is a treaty, what is a congressional-executive agreement or what is simply an executive agreement. There are considerations. There is precedent.

I go to the Foreign Affairs Manual at the State Department, and they lay out the considerations; what should be considered in determining what an agreement is—a treaty, a congressional-executive agreement or just an executive agreement. The first consideration is the extent to which the agreement involves commitments or risks affecting the Nation as a whole.

The third consideration is whether the agreement can be given effect without the enactment of subsequent legislation by Congress.

Well, the fact that we have this bill proves the fact that it needs subsequent legislation by Congress.

The fifth consideration is the preference of the Congress as to a particular type of agreement. Well, that is what we are talking about here—the Congress weighing in, in the form of my amendment, to say we want a role, we want a more robust role than is currently offered in this bill.

The seventh is the proposed duration of the agreement. We are going to be living with the impact, the effect, the results, the collateral damage of this agreement between Iran and the other negotiating parties for a very, very, very long time. So based on those considerations, based on the fact that in the State Department's own Foreign Affairs Manual in determining whether something is a treaty or an executive agreement or a congressional executive agreement, there should be consultation with Congress. I consider this amendment consultation with Congress.

Again, all I am asking in this amendment is to provide a minimal—a minimal constitutional threshold, a minimum constitutional role for Congress in affirmatively approving a deal between Iran and the rest of the world and America.

So all this amendment really does, in effect, is just asks the President to bring the agreement before the American people, before this Congress, allow us to have input, to affirmatively approve this in both Chambers, both the House and the Senate, with a mere majority vote of both Chambers. Because what is currently on the floor in this bill—and, again, I have a great deal of respect for the Senator from Tennessee. I know in his heart he believes this Senate, this Congress, should have a far more robust role and involvement in such a consequential agreement, but I also realize the challenge he has had dealing with our friends on the other side of the aisle and how very little in-

volvement they are willing to agree to for this Senate and for this Congress.

If the bill is passed, we need to clarify what that means in terms of approval. Probably the best way for me to point that out is I had a third amendment I tried to offer. It was an amendment that was going to specifically describe what this bill does with a vote of disapproval, what that threshold really means in terms of approval of this very consequential deal. So I offered an amendment: I called it a very low threshold for approval of a congressional-executive agreement. It would have allowed the agreement between Iran and the rest of the world to be approved by this body, by this Congress, with a majority vote in the House and a vote of only 34 Senators in this body.

Now, very appropriately, that amendment was ruled out of order. It was ruled unconstitutional by the Parliamentarian, as it should have been, because that is not approval of a process. That is not the way Congress should weigh in, have input, be involved in such a consequential agreement. But that is exactly—in a very convoluted process of votes of disapproval, that would have to be, first of all, voted on by 60 Senators. Then, of course, if that is vetoed, we would have to override that veto with 67 Senators and two-thirds majority in the House.

Again, what this bill does, it will allow a very bad deal—potentially very bad deal—between Iran and the rest of the world and America to be approved with a majority vote in the House and a vote of only 34 Senators in this Chamber.

Again, with that reality, with that clarity of what this bill does, the minimum role, the minimum role that this bill allows, I would urge all of my colleagues to support my amendment that provides for what should be the minimum involvement of Congress: a majority vote, an affirmative vote of approval in both the House and the Senate to any deal this administration concludes with Iran.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his great service on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I think he knows there is another amendment offered by another Senator, the Senator from Texas, that I think is very similar to this, and we are working right now with the other side to try to bring that up.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORKER. Sure.

Mr. JOHNSON. The difference between the two, as I understand them, is the amendment of the Senator from Texas would actually have a higher threshold. I think it would rise to a 60-vote threshold. I am not asking that. I am actually asking something less than that, to again clarify what this

bill allows in terms of approval by this Chamber.

So even though we discussed this earlier, I don't believe I can combine the two because I think it is important to clarify the issue with an amendment that requires what I really do believe—truly believe—should be the minimum, the minimum role, the minimum affirmative approval of disagreement: a mere majority vote in both Chambers. That is so reasonable. That is the minimum role the American people ought to have in terms of having a say in this.

I have never insisted on an amendment in 4 years in the Senate. I feel so deeply about this that I really ask both the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Tennessee, please, just allow a vote on this one amendment.

Mr. CORKER. If I could, Mr. President, the Senator is right; he doesn't offer many amendments, nor do I. But the very first amendment we voted on was the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

We had a conversation yesterday which I thought led to us considering combining this request with the request from Senator CRUZ, and I know we are working on that particular issue. But I understand, and we are trying to process these. I think he knows we are trying to process votes, and the very first one we processed was the one from the Senator from Wisconsin.

I do appreciate his concerns. I think he knows I share his concerns about this agreement. I am trying to get done what is possible. Again, if I could wave a wand and cause the national security waivers that Senator JOHNSON, myself, Senator CARDIN, and others voted for years ago when we put the sanctions in place—if I could wave a wand and those would go away, then we would be in a position where we would actually need to have an affirmative vote.

But I do appreciate his concerns. I think he knows we are trying to work through amendments down here, and I appreciate his patience as we do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I join Senator CORKER. Senator JOHNSON is a very valued member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I enjoy working with him on U.N. issues. The two of us are the Senate representatives to the United Nations this year and I know his passion on these issues, but I just want to underscore a couple points.

Right now, as of last night, there were 66 amendments that had been filed to this bill that came out of the committee 19 to 0. The number of Republican amendments were 66; the number of Democratic amendments were zero.

I point that out because we are trying to maintain the bipartisan cooperation we have had through this process so the Senate can speak with a united voice, because that gives us the strong-

est possible message as to the congressional role.

I must state, this is a delicate balance how we brought this bill forward. I don't think I am underestimating the surprise we received from our colleagues when they heard there was a 19-to-0 vote in our committee.

There are so many Members who are working with us who have filed amendments—and I thank each one of them—trying to find areas where we, as we worked in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, can find a common spot to be able to advance those amendments. I am optimistic and Senator CORKER is optimistic that we are going to be able to deal with many of the issues the Republican Members have brought up and the amendments they have filed.

But in direct response to Senator JOHNSON, let me point out, the sanctions were imposed by the U.S. Congress, by votes of the House and the Senate, and the signature of the President. What is being negotiated between our negotiating partners, the United States, and Iran, is an agreement—if they are successful, if the deal is struck—that will prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state and will provide, over time, relief from Iran from the international and U.S. sanctions that have been imposed. That is the framework.

We know the sanctions brought them to the table. We all understand that, and we are very proud of the role we played, but it is Congress, and only Congress, that can permanently change or modify that sanctions regime.

We are going to have to act. So I just take exception with Senator JOHNSON's view that we are not going to act. We are going to act because only we can permanently change the regime. But what this bill gives us is an orderly way to consider the congressional review of this agreement or deal when it is finally reached.

I just wish my colleagues would not prejudge this. I have heard so many people say something is going to happen. We don't know what the agreement is going to be. We don't even know if they are going to be able to come in with an agreement, but I will say this about the Obama administration. When they came out with the framework agreement, there were many Members of this Chamber who said Iran will never live up to the commitments in the framework agreement; that they would break out, they would not pull back, as they are committed to doing, and the sanctions regime would not be able to stay in effect. And guess what. A year later they have complied with the framework agreement, and they have in fact—the sanction regime has held tight during this period of time with our negotiating partners.

Do I share many of the concerns of my friend from Wisconsin? I do. I do share those concerns. I am concerned as to whether the agreement will, in

fact, be strong enough to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. That is what we are going to look at in our committee, if we can pass this bill in the same bipartisan manner in which we did in committee—if we can do that, the Senator from Wisconsin, the chairman, the ranking member, all of us in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are going to get all the documents, we are going to have time to review it and be able to answer those questions. The vote we are having on the floor this week is whether we are going to have that opportunity.

I know these amendments are well intended. I understand that. I understand the deep feelings each Member has. But the bottom line, if the amendment my friend is talking about got on the bill, we are not going to get that review, we are not going to have that orderly process. That is the fact.

So I think the debate on the floor is critically important. We have been debating this bill for a week. We started last Thursday, 19-to-0 vote in committee, not a single Democratic amendment. We think it is time to move this bill forward to the United States House of Representatives.

And, yes, Senator CORKER and I are going to accommodate the suggestions that have been made by Members. We are finding a way to do that, and we are going to continue to work that path. But at the end of the day, this is a very serious issue, and I agree completely with Senator GRAHAM and the comments he has made. This is an extremely important issue. It has to rise above our individual desires so, collectively, we can achieve something for the American people. That is what they want us to do. We have it in our grasps.

I applaud the leadership of Senator CORKER. He has to work with all the Republican amendments that have been filed. Believe me, there is a lot of frustration on the Democratic caucus, also as to why this bill is still on the floor and hasn't passed by now. But if we get everybody's patience, I am confident Senator CORKER and I will be able to work together so we can accommodate the reasonable requests of our Members and get this bill moving to the United States House of Representatives.

But let us maintain the balance that the Senator Foreign Relations Committee did, and let us do what the American people want us to do and that is to listen to each other. We have different views. I understand that. But the way we can reach common ground is to listen to each other and reach a reasonable compromise that doesn't compromise the principles of what we are trying to achieve. That is exactly what the Senate Foreign Relations Committee bill does. I urge my colleagues to exercise some restraint. Let's get this bill to the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the point frequently made by the supporters of this bill that this is the only way—the only way—that this body, the Congress, the Senate and the House, will receive the details of the deal. What the Senator from Maryland is saying is that this President, our Commander in Chief, will be so brazen, so arrogant as to negotiate and conclude an agreement of such import, of such consequence, and he would then keep it secret from the American people in this Congress. I hope that is not so. But if that is truly the belief, I would be happy to modify my amendment to require that same disclosure of the information of the details of the agreement. I would be happy to do that. I would be happy to work with the other side to do so. But barring that agreement, I am still urging my colleagues and I am urging this body to allow a vote on my amendment, to clarify what this bill is and what it is not. It is not advice and consent. It is the minimum—the minimum—threshold, the minimum involvement, the minimum input on the part of the American people through their elected representatives to pass judgment to approve affirmatively such a consequential agreement with a mere majority of votes of both Chambers of Congress. Is that asking so much?

It is true that we passed this bill out of the Foreign Relations Committee with a unanimous vote, because we were granted assurances. I realize this is a delicate negotiation. I realize our friends on the other side of the aisle simply refuse to have what I consider a minimum involvement.

Again, I appreciate and applaud Senator CORKER for doing a bipartisan agreement, for reaching that agreement. But our understanding was that this would be a completely open amendment process.

The Senator from Maryland points out that there are 66 amendments to 1. Let's start voting on them. We will vote on the one Democratic amendment. Let's start voting on ours. Eventually, we will tire. Eventually, we will have made our points. Eventually, we will convey to the American public what this bill is and what it is not.

Again, let me say, for a final time, what this bill provides. If passed, sure, we get the information which we should get, regardless, but it sets up a process—a very convoluted process—of votes of disapproval which would require 60 votes in this Chamber to pass. We assume it would be vetoed. Then it would require 67 votes in this Chamber to override the veto and two-thirds of a vote in the House to override that veto.

In effect—let me clarify one last time—instead of requiring the bare minimum of an affirmative vote of a majority of Members of both Chambers of Congress, this bill would allow approval of this agreement by a simple

majority in the House and only 34 Senators providing that rubber stamp of approval to a bill that could be incredibly consequential and of which we will live with the consequences—the results—for many, many years to come.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, again, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin and appreciate his service and his support of this bill. I agree with him, and I wish it were different than it is. The fact is that we will have a right to vote whether to approve or disapprove the lifting in the normal way, but that will occur 4 or 5 years down the road. I think most of us want to weigh in now before the sanctions regime totally dissipates.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business in order to introduce a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1141 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 1140 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BARRASSO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk, one for my own and one on behalf of Senator RUBIO of Florida.

Mr. President, I have said time and again—

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, has there been a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum call has been vitiated.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have said time and again that a nuclear-armed Iran is the greatest threat this country faces. I have said time and again that the Senate needs to have votes on the merits of this agreement.

The President has taken us down a very dangerous path. The President has backtracked on his own words. He said that Iran needed to live up to all of its obligations under international law. Yet Iran still has not disclosed the past military dimensions of its nuclear program.

The President said, after this negotiating process began in December of 2013, that Iran has no need for a fortified underground military bunker in Fordow. Yet our negotiators have conceded the existence, with centrifuge cascades, of that underground military bunker.

The President has said we have to have fully verifiable, anywhere, anytime access to all sites in Iran to ensure they are not cheating on any agreement—to include their military sites. Yet the leaders of Iran continue to say that we won't be able to access their military sites. There will be no intrusive inspections.

I and the Senator from Florida, as well as many other Senators, have submitted multiple amendments to ask for votes on these points. We have been consistently blocked from bringing up these amendments for a vote.

It is fine if you want to vote no. If you think Iran should keep an underground fortified military bunker with centrifuge cascades. It is fine if you don't think they should have to disclose the past military dimensions of their nuclear program, but we need to vote. We need to vote now.

It is even fine if you agree with those points and that you think this is a delicate agreement that has to be prevented from being amended in any way. But we need to vote.

If you don't want to vote, you shouldn't have come to the Senate. If you are in the Senate and you don't want to vote, you should leave. As the Senator from Florida said yesterday, be a talk show host, be a columnist. It is time we have a vote at a simple majority threshold on all of these critical points.

We are talking about a nuclear Iran, the most dangerous threat to our national security.

So the amendment I am offering first would simply take the language of the bill that came out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and add those three points. First, that Iran shouldn't keep its nuclear facility before it gets sanctions relief; that Iran can't get sanctions relief until they disclose the past military dimensions of their nuclear program. They can't get sanctions relief until they accept a fully verifiable inspections regime.

We deserve a vote on this.

AMENDMENT NO. 1197

(Purpose: Amendment of a perfecting nature)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1197 at the desk to the text proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. COTTON] proposes an amendment numbered 1197 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1140.

Mr. COTTON. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

AMENDMENT NO. 1198 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1197

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I also call up for Senator RUBIO a second-degree amendment, amendment No. 1198 to amendment No. 1197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. COTTON], for Mr. RUBIO, proposes an amendment numbered 1198 to amendment No. 1197.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a certification that Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state)

On page 3, line 20, of the amendment, strike "purpose." and insert the following: "purpose; and

"(iii) the President determines Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, again, these amendments would do two very simple things: First, they would require a vote on whether Iran should get sanctions relief before it discloses past military dimensions of its nuclear program, before it closes its underground fortified bunker at Fordow, and before it submits to a fully verifiable, anytime, anywhere, no-notice inspections regime. Second, they would require Iran to acknowledge Israel's right to exist as a Jewish democratic state before they get nuclear weapons because they continue to say that Israel would be wiped off the map, and if they get nuclear weapons, they will have the means to do so.

It is my intent to insist upon a recorded vote on these amendments at a simple-majority threshold. The Senate needs to vote. If you disagree with these policies, vote no. If you agree with these policies and you think this will upset a delicate compromise, then vote no and explain that. But we need to vote, and we should start voting.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me point out a couple things. There are

now 67 amendments, all of which have been filed by Republicans, none by Democrats.

This bill passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 19 to 0. Senator CORKER and I have been working with Republicans who have filed amendments to try to accommodate them, and we have been making progress. We have been trying to schedule additional votes. I thank Senator CORKER and those who are cooperating with us in a way that we can try to move this bill forward.

We are prepared to have votes, but I think some of the tactics that are now being deployed are going to make it much more difficult for us to be able to proceed in an orderly way. It is every Member's right to take whatever actions they want to take, but I want to tell you that for those of us who want to get this bill to the finish line, it gets a little frustrating.

We will continue to focus on a way forward on this legislation. But I want to make it clear that we have been prepared to find an orderly way to proceed with votes and to deal with the issues Members have been concerned about, but at times it becomes difficult with the procedures that are being used.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member and the ranking member's staff. I thank the minority leader's office for working with us on what was going to be a series of votes, tough votes. I have a sense that the context of this has just changed, and I regret that.

I have been working with numbers of Senators on some really controversial votes that we were willing to make, as we already have. As a matter of fact, the only two votes we have had thus far were considered poison pill votes. My friend from Maryland was willing to have more poison pill votes—if you want to call them that—tough votes, but I sense the context of this may have just changed.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, let's talk about poison pill amendments. I would say these aren't poison pills; these are vitamin pills. They are designed to strengthen this legislation and to strengthen the U.S. negotiating position.

Who could object that Israel has a right to exist as a Jewish state and that Iran should not be allowed a nuclear weapon if they won't recognize that right? The President himself said

they should close their underground fortified military bunker before they get sanctions relief. We are simply asking for a vote on what the President himself has said.

If the Senator from Maryland wants to talk about procedural tactics, let's be perfectly clear what has happened here. The very first amendment brought to the floor on this bill was designed to stop any other amendments from being offered.

For those of you watching, you should know that the only thing that amendment says is that any final agreement must be submitted in Farsi as well as English. That is a non-controversial proposal which I am sure we could adopt by voice vote and move on in an orderly fashion to any other amendments. Yet, they continue to object to unanimous consent to bring up any other amendments, designed to stop the Senate from having to cast these votes.

The amendments we have offered are no more of a procedural tactic than what the Senator from Maryland himself is doing—an amendment that could have been offered in committee, an amendment that could have been voted on easily on Tuesday when it was offered but is being used to block consideration of any other amendment.

These are not tough votes. These should be easy votes. Again, if you want to vote no, vote no. If you want to vote no and say it is designed to protect a compromise, do that. But we should be voting.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I know the Senator from Arkansas knows I have no issue with taking tough votes, and I would take them all day long.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—VETO

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, under the previous order, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the veto message.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

(The text of the President's veto message is printed on page S2094 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, 2015.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment that I plan to submit. It is amendment No. 1173. It is my intention to work with the managers of the Iran bill to get this amendment filed and voted on soon. What I wanted to do is to talk about this amendment for a little bit.

I want to begin by complimenting Senator CORKER, Senator CARDIN, and others who have worked hard on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. It is a good start to a critically important issue for all of us and for the American people. The amendment that I am proposing and that I am offering today will make that bill stronger, will give leverage to our negotiators, and will make our country more secure. That is our No. 1 priority. That is what this amendment will help us do.

The simple question this amendment proposes is this. Should the United States—our government, we, this body—allow sanctions to be lifted on a country that our own State Department has designated a state sponsor of terrorism? It is a simple, straightforward question.

In my view, the answer is also simple. The answer is no. Sanctions should not be lifted on a state sponsor of terrorism, especially one with a track record like Iran.

My amendment requires the President of the United States to declare that Iran is no longer a sponsor of state terrorism before lifting sanctions and allowing billions of dollars to flood into that country's economy. It is that simple. We should not allow, facilitate or encourage billions of dollars to go to a country that sponsors terrorism, because I fear that we have been inured to the issue of state sponsor of terrorism. I would like to focus on what that means a little bit.

Let's first start with the states that are on the list: Yemen, Syria, Sudan, Iran. These countries are all on the list because governments in each state facilitate international terrorism. We are not talking about rogue elements within a country that are killing people within their own borders. We are talking about governments themselves, the bodies in charge of a country, the bodies making and enforcing a country's laws, supporting acts of inter-

national terrorism, including against our own citizens.

Why is Iran on the list? Since its founding in 1979, the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the government have been sponsoring terrorism. In fact, our State Department has called Iran the world's most active sponsor of terrorism. Since 1979, Iran has been responsible for taking American hostages, for bombing our and our allies' embassies, and for horrible acts of murder across the globe.

Here is the key point. It has not stopped. According to the State Department, Iran continues to support terrorism—Palestinian terrorist groups—and is actively fostering instability throughout the Middle East right now, today. Last month, March 2015, a U.S. Federal judge found Iran complicit in the 2000 bombing of the USS *Cole*, the deadliest attack on a U.S. Navy vessel since 1987.

Let's talk about Iran's involvement in Iraq. I am a Marine Corps Reserve officer. In 2005, I was recalled to Active Duty for a year and a half, serving as a staff officer to the commanding general of the U.S. Central Command, John Abizaid. During that time, I deployed to many parts of the CENTCOM area of responsibility. One of the biggest concerns—perhaps the biggest concern—that we saw in Iraq during that time was the increasing threat to our troops of improvised explosive devices, especially what was referred to as explosively formed projectiles, EFPs, the most deadly and sophisticated IEDs on the battlefield.

Almost every time I was in Iraq with General Abizaid, he and his staff were briefed on the details of this threat, showing captured weapons systems, the twisted, charred remains of military vehicles that had been hit by EFPs. Those EFPs killed more American troops per attack than any other roadside bombs. They blasted through tanks, humvees or anything they hit. They were deadly. They killed and maimed thousands of our troops.

I still remember the courage and trepidation I saw in the eyes of our brave military members who had to face this threat on a daily basis, even some members of this body. To this day, I deeply distrust the leadership of the regime that was responsible for these EFPs.

Make no mistake, that country was Iran. That much was confirmed by our intelligence agencies and the State Department. But Iran has never taken responsibility for these deaths, and it has not said that it will stop this kind of terrorism.

Let me provide an example. In 2007, CENTCOM and intelligence officials provided very detailed briefings on the fact that these EFPs were coming from Iran. At the same time, Iran's U.N. Ambassador wrote an op-ed in the New York Times and said that such charges and evidence were being fabricated by the United States. That was the U.N. Ambassador from Iran, Ambassador

Zarif. In that op-ed he was telling a lie to the American people.

Why is that important? He is now the Foreign Minister of Iran. He is now in charge of negotiating this nuclear deal. He is certainly not a trustworthy man.

If sanctions are lifted, billions of dollars are going to flow from companies and banks from around the world to the economy and government of Iran. They are going to invest in businesses. They are going to invest in the oil and gas sector. They are going to invest in banks.

What will the Iranian leadership likely do with that money? Do we trust them to invest in schools and infrastructure and health clinics so they can provide their citizens better lives?

Let's use history as our guide. Everything about that country's leadership and everything about that country's history tells us that that money—billions—is likely to be used to pump up their terror machine around the world and target American citizens.

I know what we have heard from the administration: Do not worry. If there is a violation of this agreement, these sanctions will snap back into place. They will snap back—no problem, piece of cake.

After serving on Active Duty for that time I mentioned, I served as a U.S. Assistant Secretary of State. I helped lead the effort in the Bush Administration to isolate economically Iran, to go to our allies and say you have to divest out of the Iranian oil and gas sector, the Iranian financial sector.

There was no snap here. This was a slog. It took years to get companies to divest. Yet now this administration is talking that we will snap back. No problem, we will divest in a couple of days. It is a fantasy. The Administration knows it. They should stop using the term "snapback" because it is not accurate. It is not accurate.

What is the alternative? The alternative is simple. Before lifting sanctions on Iran, Iran needs to take the steps to get off the list of countries that sponsor terrorism around the world. These are not insurmountable steps. These would include having a clear record for 6 months. That is it, 6 months—not decades, not years—6 months of not sponsoring state terrorism.

It would also require Iran to renounce terrorism. Simple, don't engage in terrorism. Do not try to kill our citizens or the citizens of our allies. Do not send your forces around the world to blow things up or take hostages. Then we will consider lifting the sanctions. You do not have to be our ally. You do not have to like us. We do not have to like you. You do not have to change even the structure of your government. You just should not target our citizens for murder the way you are doing now as one of the biggest—the biggest—state sponsors of terrorism in the world.

It has been said that such a requirement and an amendment such as this

would be a poison pill, meaning that if this amendment is added to the Corker-Menendez bill, it will somehow signify the death of the bill. I have thought long and hard about that. Do I want to be a Member of this body who introduces a poison pill? Am I being unreasonable with this amendment?

What I came to is this. It is our job—the most important job we have in this body—to do everything we can to keep our citizens safe and to enact good policy. Sometimes that means taking difficult positions, and sometimes it means taking very reasonable positions, even though the political process might make it seem as if this were a complicated and difficult issue. This is not complicated. This is not difficult. This amendment is a simple amendment. It is not difficult.

I wish to conclude with the question I began with. Is it good policy for the United States of America to allow or even encourage countries and corporations to do business with a state sponsor of terrorism, particularly one that has a history of targeting and killing our citizens? Is that good policy?

I believe the vast majority of the American people—Democrat, Republican, any State in the Union—would say no, that is not good policy. I believe that if the question were posed directly to the American people, they would not consider this some kind of poison pill. They might even consider this some kind of vitamin pill, one that will make us stronger. It is a supplement to strengthen our negotiators' position.

Right now there is confusion. It is in the press. The Iranians are saying we have a deal that lifts sanctions immediately. The President has said no, that is not necessarily clear. We have to be creative on how this is going to happen.

This amendment will give the President and Secretary Kerry the leverage to solve this critical issue, one that the President and the Secretary of State should use and welcome to strengthen our position in the negotiations and not view it as some kind of poison pill.

Again, it is a simple amendment. Before sanctions are lifted, the President and the State Department need to make sure Iran is off the list of states that sponsor terrorism. Iran could take the simple steps to make that possible and the world would be a much safer place.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FDA TOBACCO DEEMING REGULATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, a number of my colleagues came to the floor yesterday to speak about the FDA's failure to release the tobacco deeming rule and the delays that have occurred with respect to that rule.

As difficult as the American people may find it to understand why there are these delays in issuing a rule that protects our citizens against tobacco use—most particularly our children—we should all understand that these rules have real-life consequences.

Tobacco, in fact, is the leading cause of preventable death. In this Nation, tobacco use kills more than half a million people every year. Most smokers and tobacco users begin as children, many under the age of 10. Each day, more than 3,200 people younger than 18 years old smoke their first cigarette, and the consequences are inevitable. Thousands of them will die early in life.

Cigarettes are the only product in the world that, when used as the manufacturer intends it, kills the customer. If smoking continues at the current rate among U.S. youth, 5.6 million of them are expected to die prematurely from smoking-related illness.

Tobacco use is a path to addiction and disease, and it is a public health epidemic. Yet laws that protect the public, laws that forbid marketing to children, laws that are designed to uphold the public trust have been unimplemented.

My fight against Big Tobacco began in the 1990s, when I was attorney general of the State of Connecticut. I helped to lead a lawsuit against tobacco companies for marketing to children. We succeeded in restricting tobacco companies from selling to and targeting children in their ads through sporting events, magazines, and point of sale methods. We helped reimburse the States for the enormous amount of taxpayer dollars spent on tobacco-related diseases, and those payments continue today. They are supposed to be used for prevention and cessation activities, but unfortunately and tragically, much of that money is now used to fill gaps in State budgets.

I have continued my fight against the tobacco companies in the Senate, alongside dedicated colleagues such as Senator MERKLEY and Senator DURBIN, who spoke yesterday, in urging the FDA to seek relief, to strive to do its job with the tobacco deeming rule in order to protect children and families from tobacco.

The Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act of 2009 gave the FDA significant power and responsibility to achieve this goal. Now it is the FDA's responsibility to implement that law to prevent young people from becoming nicotine addicts, damaging their health, risking their lives, and costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions—in fact, billions—of dollars.

Six years have passed since that law was passed. The FDA has yet to implement it, and the reason is that it has yet to issue those regulations. It wasn't until last year, April 2014—5 years after the measure passed—that the FDA took the first step, issuing draft regulations known as the deeming rule that would formalize this authority. The rule would allow the FDA to control the regulation and sale—in particular, the sale to minors—of e-cigarettes, as well as dangerous combustible products, such as hookah, pipe tobacco, and cigars.

This past Saturday, April 25, was the 1-year anniversary of the release of the proposed rule. Over the past year, youth use of unregulated tobacco products, such as e-cigarettes and the hookah, has skyrocketed. E-cigarette use has tripled among 11- to 18-year-olds, while hookah use has almost doubled.

There is clear data, absolutely irrefutable evidence that the rate of use of these products has increased even as some of the use of tobacco products has diminished, and this chart illustrates that evidence. It indicates that use of the regulated products has diminished, while use of unregulated products has increased. So laws work. Rules have an effect. People can be saved from addiction and disease. And these products—cigars, pipes, hookahs, e-cigarettes—lead to tobacco use in cigarettes and addiction to nicotine. They create the same kind of public health menace that tobacco products do.

We know that nicotine addiction is surging through e-cigarette use, which is a disastrous tribute to the ingenuity of Big Tobacco. In fact, many of the big tobacco companies have bought the e-cigarette companies because they know they can use the e-cigarettes as a gateway nicotine-delivery device, addicting children so that they will then shift to cigarette tobacco.

I am joining my colleagues in urging that the FDA act as quickly as possible to implement these rules, to finalize the regulations, to get them out of the regulatory apparatus, the morass in which they are now trapped, and make sure that our children and our citizens are protected against the marketing and other abuses that are involved in the current sale of these nicotine-delivery devices marketed to children.

I am also proud to be introducing today a new measure, the Tobacco Tax and Enforcement Reform Act, which is supported by Senators DURBIN, REED, and BOXER. I am very grateful to them for their leadership not only on this measure but over many years in fighting this battle against nicotine addiction and tobacco use.

Congress has a continuing responsibility to combat cigarette smoking directly. Right now, there are a number of areas where loopholes and gaps exist in the enforcement structure. We need to do more to fight illegal tobacco trafficking. We need to eliminate the tax disparities between different tobacco products. These gaps in our laws and

law enforcement failures create opportunities and incentives for violations of those laws, at great cost to the State with regard to illegal trafficking.

Similar to the changes outlined in the President's budget proposal, this bill would also increase the Federal tax rate on tobacco products. In fact, these reforms would help the Federal Government and States collect nearly \$100 billion at a time when our States are strapped fiscally and our Federal Government needs that revenue as well. These revenues would not only reduce tobacco consumption, they would also aid the fiscal well-being of our State and local governments.

Most importantly from the standpoint of law enforcement, it would force criminals who engage in illegal trafficking to comply with the law. It would combat those criminals who profit from the illegal sale of these products and trafficking across State lines, who are selling illicitly and gaining huge numbers of dollars from that legal noncompliance.

Economic research confirms that raising the price of tobacco reduces use among young people, who are particularly sensitive to pricing. They are sensitive to price increases because they have less disposable income and know they have fewer dollars to spend. They are more price-sensitive. In fact, every 10 percent increase in the real price of cigarettes will reduce the prevalence of adult smoking by 5 percent and youth smoking by 7 percent. Adults are price-sensitive, too. Increasing the cost of cigarettes makes people more likely to want to quit and to pursue tobacco cessation, to break the nicotine habit and seek help through quit lines, the nicotine patch, and other pharmaceutical measures.

The current tobacco tax code has many loopholes that enable even the least creative manufacturers to exploit them and incentivizes many manufacturers to manipulate products so they can be classified in a lower tax category. These tax incentives and loopholes not only sharply reduce Federal revenues, but they increase the overall use of tobacco and tobacco-related harms. Eliminating these tax disparities, along with the price, is one of the goals of the measure I am introducing today. By taxing all products at the same level as cigarettes, we can make progress against nicotine addiction and the illnesses and diseases associated with tobacco use.

The increase in tax rate on cigarettes by 94 percent per pack and setting the rates for other tobacco products to an equivalent amount would help people who are now addicted and would also help America because at the end of the day the real cost of cigarettes is not only to people who are addicted and who endure the suffering and the pain of cancer, lung disease, and heart problems, it is to their families and to all taxpayers. All of us—literally, all of us—pay for the diseases that result from tobacco use through our insur-

ance policies and through Medicare and Medicaid. We are the ones who bear the financial burden.

Due to these current tax inequities, the GAO has projected \$615 million to \$1.1 billion in losses to Federal tax revenue right now, and tobacco-related health problems cost the country almost \$170 billion a year in direct medical costs. We can save money and save lives through this measure. I hope my colleagues will support it.

Every day that goes by without FDA regulation harms children. It hurts people who become addicted. It hurts all of America. Every day that tax disparities exist, every day that illegal trafficking continues is a day when America pays in the casualties, human suffering, loss of productivity, and loss of revenue.

I hope my colleagues will support these efforts.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Thank you, Madam President.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

I rise today to discuss the negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program. Many of my colleagues have spoken at length about some of their concerns, which I share. Today, however, I would like to discuss my concern about the administration's increasing reliance on the idea that sanctions can be snapped back into place in the event that Iran violates an agreement.

In its press release on the framework agreed upon earlier this month, the White House stated:

If at any time Iran fails to fulfill its commitments, these sanctions will snap back into place.

On April 11, 2015, President Obama stated:

We are preserving the capacity to snap back sanctions in the event they are breaking any deal. . . . And if . . . we don't have the capacity to snap back sanctions when we see a potential violation, then we're probably not going to get a deal.

A week later, at a press conference with the Italian Prime Minister, President Obama played down the question of whether Iran would receive immediate sanctions relief and insisted snap-back provisions were more important. He said:

Our main concern here is making sure that if Iran doesn't abide by its agreement, that we don't have to jump through a whole bunch of hoops in order to reinstate sanctions. That is our main concern.

I agree with President Obama's goal. Who wouldn't want harsh measures reinstated the moment Iran fails to comply with this agreement? The problem is that reality is far more complicated than the simple phrase "snapback" suggests.

In a Washington Post column last week, former CIA Director Michael Hayden, former Deputy Director General of the IAEA Olli Heinonen, and Middle East expert Dr. Ray Takeyh

laid out the long and circuitous path that any action to reinstate sanctions on Iran would have to take. Their conclusion? That it could take an entire year or even longer to simply confirm that Iran has actually violated its obligations and navigate the bureaucratic process necessary to restore the sanctions on Iran.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal by Henry Kissinger and George Shultz made a similar point. In it, they write:

Restoring the most effective sanctions would require coordinated international action. In countries that had reluctantly joined in previous rounds, the demands of public and commercial opinion will militate against automatic or even prompt "snapback."

Some may argue that past history is irrelevant and that the negotiations will produce a new process, allowing for a quick restoration of the sanctions regime. Such a process would still be far from automatic since significant time would be required to confirm Iran's violation, but recent comments by Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov made clear that this idea is not in the cards. Speaking last week on the idea of snapping back sanctions, he stated: "This process should not in any way be automatic." He went on to say that decisions on this matter should be taken in accordance with the procedures of the U.N. Security Council through voting in the Council and through the adoption of the appropriate resolutions. We must also bear in mind that sanctions take time to have effect.

The United States has had sanctions on Iran since 1979. One could argue that the heavy sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table—they began back in 2010. But even in that case it took years to create enough economic pressure for Iran to even sit down with negotiators. The idea that we will be able to swiftly reimpose sanctions and that those sanctions are going to swiftly cripple the Iranian economy and that they are going to force Iran to change its behavior—I believe that is simply implausible.

The point is the practical reality of this issue is much more complicated than the talking points suggest. To me, this underscores the importance of getting a good deal with Iran. It demonstrates why a bad deal is so much worse than no deal at all. It took many years to build the global sanctions regime that brought Iran to the negotiating table. The fact is that it can be dismantled much faster than it can be rebuilt.

We cannot afford to overlook key provisions or pretend that the precise terms of this agreement are of lesser importance. Of all the tools we can use to influence Iran, sanctions relief is the most important. It should only be provided as part of a deal that is clearly in American interests. The security of our country, our families, and the possibility of a nuclear Middle East hangs in the balance.

There will be no simple snapback if this agreement does not hold. We need to be honest with the American people and not rely on unrealistic notions to justify any deal with them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak for a few minutes on the bill we are debating to provide some congressional oversight over a potential—though not yet signed—deal with Iran.

I wish to start simply with what we all agree on. We all agree we need to do whatever we can to ensure that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. I have no doubt that 100 Members of the Senate would agree with that proposition. That is our guiding principle, and it should be our North Star. We may disagree on the best way to achieve a nuclear weapons-free Iran, but we can all agree on our goal.

So how do we get there is the question we are debating. I happen to be a member of the camp who believes our best hope of achieving this goal is through diplomacy, through a negotiated settlement that dramatically rolls back Iran's nuclear program in a transparent and verifiable way. While our negotiations still have a long way to go to get to that agreement, we are closer now than we have been in decades.

I, and many of my colleagues, strongly believe we should give our negotiators the space to do their jobs and to see if a deal is ultimately possible.

That is really what this bill does. It postpones a congressional vote on these negotiations, appropriately, until the negotiations are finished. That makes sense, right? There is no use on voting on a deal when we don't have a deal. And then it sets up time constraints for Congress's review of that potential deal, basically, about 30 days. That is a reasonable period of time for us to debate the agreement, and, if there is one, there is some certainty over our process to those who are at the negotiating table.

The President's critics seem to fall into two often overlapping camps. One strain of argument holds that this framework agreement we have right now is just too weak and that our side should walk away from the table, reimpose sanctions, and hold out for a better deal.

The second strain of argument—evidenced, frankly, by many of the amendments that have been filed to the underlying bill—holds that our negotiations shouldn't be just about Iran's nuclear program, that we should

also be negotiating over all of the other bad things Iran does and supports.

Now, I don't think it is worth getting into a defense of a framework today since we are months away from a final deal. But to my mind, if the final deal does look demonstrably like the framework, we would be fools to reject it. Does it allow Iran to do nuclear research? Yes, it does. Does it allow them to keep some centrifuges? Yes. But anybody who thought we were going to sign a deal that would effectively be an unconditional surrender was living in a fantasyland. The framework accomplishes our goal of protecting Israel, the region, and the United States from a quick nuclear breakout. The plutonium pathway at Arak is ended. Their enriched stores basically go down to zero. Fordow and Natanz stay open, but they can no longer do substantial enrichment, and they are going to have international scientists and inspectors crawling all over their capacity. Inspections, on the entire nuclear supply chain, will be at a scale that is totally, completely unprecedented in the history of the nuclear age.

It is a good framework. But even if you don't believe this, I just think it belies common sense to think that walking away from the table now would get you a better deal. Yes, we could reinstitute sanctions, the United States could. Perhaps some of our partners would go along, but they would be weaker than before because lots of countries that think this is a good framework wouldn't go along with this. Just look at what Russia and China have announced in the past few weeks. They basically have telegraphed that they are looking to do business with the Iranians, notwithstanding what happens at the negotiating table. We know what happens when we apply weak sanctions against Iran, alongside a policy of isolating. They get stronger.

How do we know this? Because in 2002 we had a chance to cap Iran's centrifuges at a few hundred. Instead, after years of relatively weak sanctions and international isolation, Iran built 20,000 centrifuges and put in place a secret nuclear facility.

Now, our most recent round of tough international sanctions—in part because of the policies of this Congress—worked to get to the table, to the negotiating table, but only because there was a credible offer of a negotiated solution. We know exactly what happens, what sanctions and isolation get us, because we tried it for years. It gets us 20,000 centrifuges, no international inspections, and an increasingly hard-line and inward-looking regime.

This last point and result is important because the people of Iran actually don't think like their Supreme Leader. His grasp on power isn't absolute, in large part because Iranians are much more moderate, much more internationalist, and much more pro-American than their leader, generally.

Khamenei knows this, and that is why, when Iranian voters elected a moderate, Western-oriented President, the Supreme Leader allowed his team the space to negotiate this framework.

Now, no one can be certain, but it is certainly plausible to believe that moderate forces inside Iran are winning and that our policy toward Iran should consider whether our actions help the moderates or help the hard-liners. We don't want another hard-line administration, but we are going to get one if we walk away from these negotiations now, when thousands of Iranians are cheering the opening of relations with the West. If we walk away, moderate voters are going to feel abandoned. Hard-liners will be proven right. The two groups will be merged. Politics inside Iran will shift inward and extreme again. For all of my Republican colleagues who were so forceful in their criticism of the administration, saying President Obama didn't do enough to support the Green Revolution, you would do far more damage to this cause by ending reformers' hopes of rapprochement with the West right now.

Now, for the second argument—that we should settle all of our grievances with Iran in one fell swoop right now, that this agreement is somehow illegitimate unless Iran renounces Hamas and Hezbollah, unless they get right with Israel, unless they end their other nonnuclear weapons programs, unless they release political prisoners, and so on and so on.

First, there is not a single person here who agrees with Iran's support for terrorism or its inflammatory rhetoric toward Israel. No one is pleased with the Iranian regime's record on human rights or its funding of Hezbollah.

But let's agree that an Iran that pursues these policies and has a nuclear weapon is a far worse outcome, one that should be avoided at all costs. The truth is that adding these issues into the nuclear agreement would mean no deal is possible.

In America, we are strong enough to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We can negotiate with an enemy or adversary on one issue and reserve the right to fight another day or simultaneously on other issues. For evidence of this, I would ask my Republican friends to simply look to their great, romanticized hero, President Ronald Reagan. When he was negotiating a nuclear weapons deal with the Soviet Union, he did not simultaneously try to address the USSR's support for proxies in Central America or the Middle East or their provocative naval activities in the Pacific Ocean, he knew that by taking one issue off the table it would make America and the world safer, even if it didn't address all of our grievances at once. He knew if he did put everything on the table all at once, then there would be no progress.

Just as a little kid can't eat a hot dog all in one bite no matter how hard he tries, we all have to make progress

one bite at a time. That is often how life and, in fact, negotiations tend to work.

So I hope my colleagues will oppose these well-meaning amendments that are being offered. They have laudable goals, but in the real world they are simply unrealistic within the confines of these negotiations, and they will have the effect of killing the deal entirely.

On a broader scale, I hope when this debate is done, we can also ask ourselves some bigger questions. Diplomacy is power. It is not weakness. Talking to your enemies has been part of our national security toolbox for as long as we have existed as a nation.

This country is tired. It is weary of war for good reason. Ten years of conflict in Iraq didn't make us any safer, and a lot of people—heroes—died in the process.

But when we spend all of this time—the majority of this Congress—engaged in detailed oversight over the President's diplomatic endeavors and absolutely no time engaged in detailed oversight over a war in Iraq and Syria that is still, months and months later, unauthorized and extraconstitutional, then we send a bad message to America and to the rest of the world. We seem to have a developing double standard when it comes to oversight. We are all over the President when he talks to our adversaries, but we stand down when he fights them—lots of oversight over peace, very little over war.

That is not where the American people are. They want their President to take extraordinary steps to avoid war. They don't want us to get dragged back into a ground war in the Middle East.

I am supporting this bill today because I will be first in line to reassert Congress's power to set foreign policy right alongside the President, but I don't support Congress sending a message that diplomacy is somehow more worthy of rigorous oversight than military action.

I don't think this is where the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is coming from, but there are certainly some Members of his caucus who view power solely through a military lens. That is dangerous because, as we saw in Iraq, large-scale military operations kill a lot of terrorists, they kill a lot of bad guys, but they often create two for every one they kill.

In the end, it is nonkinetic intervention that solves extremism, building inclusive governments, lifting people out of destitution and poverty, countering radical propaganda, and showing an America that backs up all of its talk about American civil liberties with action.

I am so thankful to Chairman CORKER for taking the time to work on this bill with Senator CARDIN, Senator MENENDEZ, and others to make it something we can truly rally around today. That takes guts to show patience, to give ground, and to talk to people whom you don't agree with.

It is actually diplomacy that wins the day here more often than not. It is our guiding value as a body, as an institution. It is what makes this place work when it works, and we are best when we recognize that the value of diplomacy and the results we get from it do not expire at the edges of this Chamber.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we are finally seeing the Senate do what we were elected to do, and that is the people's work. I am glad to see there have been some reports in the press saying the 114th Congress and the new majority are actually following through and keeping our promises by passing important legislation that helps make the American people's lives just a little bit better.

One of the actions we have taken is the House and the Senate have now met in a conference committee to agree on a budget. This is, unfortunately, an unusual event in recent history. It was 2009 when the last budget was passed by the U.S. Congress. That is a little embarrassing. It is actually very embarrassing. It is a scandal, really. But now we are finally getting back on track. I am glad to report, as the Presiding Officer knows, that this is a budget that balances in roughly 9 years. I wish it were sooner, but that is what it is. There are no tax increases. It also meets our obligation to keep the country safe and the American people secure by plussing up some of the defense accounts, which I believe is important. All of our colleagues on our side of the aisle believe this should be our No. 1 priority. There are some things that only the Federal Government can do, and national security is at the very top of that list.

So we will have a vote—perhaps as early as next Tuesday—on the budget conference report.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN ALLIANCE AND TRADE

Mr. President, yesterday, we had a joint meeting of Congress, and we heard from the leader of one of America's greatest allies, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe of Japan. I had a chance to meet the Prime Minister briefly before his comments, and I told him: Mr. Prime Minister, I actually graduated from high school in Japan. My dad was in the U.S. Air Force and was stationed at Tachikawa Air Force Base, and that is where I attended my senior year in high school.

It was an honor for all of us to listen to the Prime Minister. As were many of my colleagues, I was very encouraged to hear about his unwavering sup-

port for the U.S.-Japan alliance. This is one of the most important alliances the United States has in the world.

The Prime Minister spent a good amount of time talking about our shared values. He noted our mutual and unflinching commitment to democracy and freedom and our common goal of peace and prosperity.

One of the issues I was particularly glad to hear the Prime Minister speak about was the shared values of freedom and democracy and why the Trans-Pacific Partnership is so important not just to the United States, not just to Japan, but to all, I believe, 12 different countries that are negotiating this important trade agreement.

I couldn't agree more about the importance of trade. Texas is the No. 1 exporting State in the Nation, and that is one of the reasons we are doing relatively well compared to the rest of the country economically. I know the Presiding Officer comes from an oil-producing and gas-producing State that is booming as well. But one of the reasons my State is doing so well is because we figured out that the more people we can sell goods and services to that we grow or we raise or we make, the more jobs we have at home, the better our economy is, and the better our people are.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership fits right into that formulation because the United States occupies roughly 5 percent of the planet and we represent about 20 percent of the purchasing power of the planet. So that should tell us that 80 percent of the purchasing power lies outside and beyond our shores, and why in the world wouldn't we want to trade with those other countries and sell goods and services to consumers in Japan and all around the world, including the region of Asia on which the Pacific partnership is particularly focused?

The Prime Minister eloquently articulated that the Trans-Pacific Partnership promotes the spread of our values by reducing economic barriers. It has been observed by smarter people than I that countries that actually trade together are much less likely to go to war against each other. That just seems to be the way it works. And the more people we can improve our economic ties to around the world—it improves not only prosperity, it also improves the peace.

Prime Minister Abe understands how important this agreement is not only for the 12 nations that make up the TPP but for the entire global economy. This is at least in part because the 12 Asia-Pacific countries involved in the partnership make up 40 percent of the world economy. Thankfully, the Prime Minister assured us that he will continue to work with the United States to ensure the success of these negotiations.

In a short time—perhaps maybe next week or the week after—we will have

an opportunity to take up trade promotion authority. This is congressionally conferred authority to the executive branch to engage in negotiations and sets the parameters for those negotiations—very clear congressional direction for the President's negotiators, including Ambassador Froman, in negotiating this Trans-Pacific Partnership. Once the negotiations are concluded, then it will have to lie in public for up to 60 days, I believe the timeframe is, so the American people can read it, to be completely transparent, and I think that is a very important part of the process.

I would be remiss, as I suggested earlier, if I did not point out the important role of trade not only to the United States but also to my State of Texas. About \$1.5 trillion of GDP is attributable to the State of Texas. If we were an independent nation—which we once were for 9 years; from independence to the time we were annexed to the United States in 1845—if we were still an independent nation, we would represent the 12th largest economy in the world. It would put us ahead of even robust economies such as those in Mexico and South Korea. It is primarily because of the role of exports.

Energy is an incredibly important part of our economy, but it is not all of our economy. If we could do what the Presiding Officer and others have advocated, which is to accelerate the export of liquefied natural gas and perhaps reconsider the ban on exporting crude under some appropriate circumstances, I think we could do even better.

According to a report released earlier this month by the Department of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative, Texas was far and away the leader of goods exported in 2014, with \$289 billion of goods exported—\$289 billion. So, not to brag—well, Texans have been known to brag a little bit—but just to state the facts—let me put it that way. The State of California—the State with the second most goods exported by value—exported a sizable \$174 billion worth. Now, that is a lot, \$174 billion for California, but it is still \$115 billion less than the No. 1 State of Texas. The same report revealed that Texas also boasts some 41,000 companies—many small- and medium-sized businesses—that export goods globally.

For years, this impressive amount of trade has helped our economy continue to grow, while providing jobs for Texans across the State. In fact, more than 1 million jobs in Texas are supported by global exports. So why wouldn't we want to do more and create more jobs and more prosperity and more opportunity?

I agree with Prime Minister Abe that the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal is vitally important to the United States, particularly at a time, as we learned—I guess it was yesterday, maybe the day before—that the gross domestic product of the United States had grown by an anemic .2 percent in the last quarter, essentially saying our econ-

omy has flatlined. That is dangerous, and it is also painful for the families of people who are out of work or who are looking for work or those who have simply dropped out of the workforce. We need to do better by growing our economy and creating those jobs so people can find work and provide for their families.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would help Texas businesses. It would also help our farmers and ranchers, both big and small. Obviously, the agricultural exports and particularly the beef and poultry and pork exports to a country such as Japan would be very important.

As the President said the other day, if we don't enter into this Trans-Pacific Partnership deal where we will be setting the rules, along with these 12 countries—if we don't do this, what will happen is that China will, in essence, be setting the rules for Asia. That is a circumstance we should not sit by and let happen.

Increasing trade in the region will also provide a way forward for 21st-century industries that have made a home in Texas, including electronics and machinery. We are not as well known for electronics manufacturing and machinery as we are for the energy business or farming and ranching and agriculture. But, importantly, as Prime Minister Abe mentioned yesterday, the TPP goes far beyond just economic benefits; it also provides the United States an opportunity for greater influence in the region and in the process promotes not only prosperity, as I said earlier, but also stability and security.

Just last week, the Dallas Morning News made this point well by saying that TPP is “not just about exports and imports; it's also about enhancing America's role among Pacific nations and standing strong against an assertive China.” President Obama made that point as well, and I happen to think in this case he is absolutely right.

Texas and our entire country stands to gain a lot from this pending trade deal. I am happy to see the President is promoting this among some members of his own party, who are a little bit divided on this issue. I think it is fair to say that on this side of the aisle we are a little more unified on this issue. This is not, though, an objective we are going to be able to get done unless the President steps up and delivers votes from that side of the aisle from members of his own political party, and I hope he will roll up his sleeves and he will dive right in and engage and produce those votes. We can't produce those votes on that side of the aisle; only the President, the leader of his party, can do that.

So I am happy to see that this Chamber, this U.S. Senate, has continued in a spirit of bipartisanship by passing trade promotion authority out of the Senate Finance Committee, and I hope we will take it up here as a body very soon.

In conclusion, this legislation will open up American goods and services to American markets, which is good for our economy, good for jobs, and good for better wages for hard-working Americans, including Texas families.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that is before the Senate today. I thank Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN for their incredible work bringing people together on the Foreign Relations Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill as written. We must move forward to pass this legislation as quickly as possible to ensure that Congress has a role in reviewing any proposed nuclear agreement with Iran.

This is a critically important bill at a critically important time. Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is one of the most important objectives of our national security policy, and I strongly supported the sanctions every step of the way that brought Iran to the negotiating table.

I have also supported the diplomatic efforts to address the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program. The framework that was reached in Switzerland earlier this month is a positive step forward, but I think we all know that this process is far from complete.

There are so many unanswered questions on the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program, on how its uranium stockpile would be handled, under what circumstances any sanctions relief would be provided, and the timing of that relief.

It is clear that there are still differences between Iran and the rest of the international community on these issues. I believe it is important that negotiations continue to pursue a final agreement by June 30 that comprehensively addresses the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program. Again, one of the most important objectives of the U.S. national security policy is to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

The bipartisan legislation before us today will set up a process for Congress to review any final nuclear agreement with Iran. It ensures that Congress, which through its actions brought Iran to the table, will have access to all the final details of the agreement. It preserves our right to have a final say in the potential lifting of the sanctions that we led on. That is how we were involved in compelling Iran to negotiate in terms of these sanctions.

Senators CORKER and CARDIN worked so hard to strike a careful balance between the Executive's prerogative to pursue the negotiations and Congress's role in reviewing any nuclear agreement. Their negotiations were a success, as I said. The bill passed the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously, 19 to 0, 2 weeks ago. That is a committee with a number of Senators with a broad range of views on every issue, including foreign relations and including these negotiations.

The President, who had long threatened to veto any such bill, has agreed to sign it. This is a significant victory for the Senate and also for congressional oversight of foreign policy, something many of us have been pushing for.

Any nuclear agreement with Iran will have significant long-term implications for the United States, for Israel, and for our allies in the region. So it is critical that Congress have the opportunity to review it.

This bill ensures that we have that opportunity. That is why it is so important that we act now to pass this legislation without delay and without amendments that undercut the bipartisan agreement on this bill.

Right now, I understand there are negotiations over a number of amendments that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to offer. I think we know that a number of these amendments appear to be written in a way that would undermine the bipartisan support for the bill or would somehow make this bill much more difficult in terms of having a process.

All this bill is, from my mind, is a process to review. Instead of having a haphazard process, this actually gives Congress something for which we have been asking for a long time. It has given us that ability to review this agreement and have a vote on it. I don't know how many times I have heard my colleagues from the other side of the aisle talk about it—and my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We finally have a bipartisan way to do it. So I think we need to be very careful when moving forward and look at some of these amendments.

I certainly share my colleagues' deep mistrust and skepticism of the Iranian regime. I am appalled by the continuing human rights abuses, the unjustified detention of American citizens—everyone, from the Washington Post reporter to a former marine to a Christian pastor. I abhor the vicious threats we are hearing against Israel and against Israeli leaders, the track record supporting anti-Semitism and the Holocaust denial. I am deeply concerned about the destabilizing actions in the region, including Iran's efforts to obtain more advanced missiles, and the support for militant forces and terrorists.

I think we all know the issues that are going on here. It is incredibly important that we work to address these issues, but there must be a recognition

of the fact that what we are talking about here is a nuclear agreement. I think every Senator is going to want to look at that agreement and say: Does this make things safer or not? What effect does this have on Israel? Is it safer to have Iran have nuclear capabilities when they have shown the propensity to do all of these other things that I have just mentioned? I think many of us come down on the side that we want to see this agreement but we are pleased these negotiations are going on. We are particularly thankful that Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN were able to come to an agreement on a process and to get that agreement through a highly diverse committee in terms of their political views and to get that agreement through on a 19-to-0 vote.

Also, I might add that we don't want to revive the threat of a Presidential veto here. I know many of these amendments sound appealing to many of us but not if they are going to be used as a way to bring down this process, the review agreement, and that is essentially what would happen.

We do not want to be damaging our own ability to ensure that sanctions relief will only come from a strong agreement that prevents Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. I would think that outcome would certainly be fine with the Iranians, if that is what happens. As our Republican colleague from South Carolina, LINDSEY GRAHAM, pointed out recently, "Anybody who offers an amendment that will break this agreement apart . . . the beneficiary will be the Iranians."

So let's not give the Iranians a victory. Let's pass this bill on a strong bipartisan vote, and let's do it now so it is clear that Congress stands united and we want the ability to review this agreement. Our foreign policy is more effective when we speak with one voice. It may be simplistic to say that politics should stop at the water's edge, but when it comes to Iran, the fact is, we have been unified. The past three votes in favor of major sanctions legislation in 2010, 2011, and 2012 have been unanimous—99 to 0, 100 to 0, and 94 to 0 respectively. And now the Iranians are at the table negotiating a nuclear agreement. That is because we stood together across party lines.

We have stood together and been strong and unified as a country. The time has come to show we are serious again—serious about ensuring that a final agreement is strong and enforceable and, most importantly, blocks Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. We may not agree on everything, but we must certainly agree on something that so many of us have been talking about—a role for the Congress, a role for the Senate in having a say over this agreement. That is all this bill is about. Passing this bill will show our commitment to our country's security and the security of our allies and our partners. It transcends partisan politics, and that is something that, when

it comes to foreign relations and when it comes to dealing with a country such as Iran, must stop at the water's edge.

I thank our colleagues, Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN, for working so hard to negotiate this agreement—simply a process of review—so that we can finally have a say, and I ask my colleagues to support this.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, sometimes when I travel, people ask me what I do, and I tell them I am a retired Navy captain. And then they say: Well, what do you do now? And I tell them I am a recovering Governor. Then they say: Well, now that you are recovering, what do you do? I tell them I am a servant.

Once, one guy said to me on an airplane: What do you mean you are a servant?

I said: I serve the people of Delaware. He said: Are you like a butler?

And I said: No, not really, but I do serve.

But I still think like a retired recovering Governor. I am proud to be able to serve here. I loved being in the Navy. But at heart, I still think and act a good deal like a retired Governor. Those others who serve here in this body who have served as the chief executive of their State sometimes feel the same way about how they approach their job. I love doing that. I feel really lucky to have that choice. I feel very lucky to be here to serve Delaware, the First State, in this capacity.

One of the key takeaways from my time as the chief executive of my State was that when we had to negotiate deals, whether with our neighboring States or with the Federal Government or actually with folks who were thinking of starting a business in Delaware or growing a business in Delaware, we had to do so with one unified voice in order to be effective.

Now, we were trying to bring AstraZeneca, one of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world, and convince them to put their North American headquarters in Delaware. We didn't have the whole legislature to negotiate that deal. My cabinet and I were involved in that negotiation, and we got a signoff from the legislature, at least indirectly. We just couldn't have competing messages coming from all the various elected officials, State senators, State representatives, and so forth. The reason is that this would have undermined in some cases very sensitive negotiations and hindered our ability to work through some already tough issues. While I would consult

with Delaware's other State and local officials, as appropriate—and I valued their insight and their opinions, even when I didn't necessarily agree with all of them any more than they agreed with me—at the end of the day, as chief executive of our State, I had to be the final decisionmaker in a lot of cases in negotiating or advocating on behalf of Delaware.

Now, as a U.S. Senator, I take really a very similar approach to negotiating on many issues, including matters of foreign policy. I support the idea that when the United States conducts diplomacy with foreign governments, the United States should speak to that government with a unified voice.

Our system is set up so that we do not have 535 Members of Congress serving as negotiators and diplomats—and for good reason. That is the case with trade deals—the kind of deal we are trying to negotiate today with 11 other countries that come from this hemisphere all the way over to Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, Japan, and Vietnam. But if we fail to speak with a unified voice in most of those negotiations, including the one I just mentioned, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, then forging international agreements with other countries is going to be really tough and in some cases just about impossible.

When it comes to the negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program—the negotiations that involve not just Iran, not just us, but the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and Germany as well—I have been a strong proponent of giving the President and his negotiating team the flexibility they need to achieve the best deal for our Nation.

I know many of our colleagues have strong views on the need for Congress to play a direct role in the negotiations and to make sure their voices are heard in this process. I understand that position, and I respect that position as well.

There are also some in the Senate who believe that the best deal with Iran is, frankly, no deal at all, and they are trying to maximize their ability to kill the nuclear deal with Iran before it is ever finalized.

Another key lesson I learned as Governor—and I am constantly reminded of it in the Senate—is that forging compromise is no easy task. Bridging the divide of competing interests is never easy, especially on issues as important as negotiations over nuclear weapons and Iran. But that is what my colleagues—our colleagues—in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently did.

Specifically, Senators CORKER of Tennessee and CARDIN of Maryland, one a Republican and one a Democrat, worked to forge a compromise that identifies an appropriate role for Congress in these nuclear talks. This compromise will enable the President to maintain his prerogative as our Nation's Chief Executive and Commander

in Chief to negotiate on behalf of the United States, while also ensuring that Congress is able to weigh in on the final product of those negotiations should they come to fruition. In my mind, that is a reasonable compromise that we should all support regardless of our opinion on the prospect of the President reaching an acceptable deal with Iran.

Let me explain why. First of all, Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN's compromise satisfies one of my key goals of not undermining our negotiating team before any final deal can be reached with the Iranians.

Second, for those who insist that Congress be given a chance to weigh in on a final nuclear deal with Iran, this bill that we are debating today and will probably debate a little more next week will empower Members of Congress to cast a vote for or against any final deal before it is implemented.

Finally, for those Members who think that no deal is the best deal, this bill gives those Members the opportunity to make their case to our respective colleagues at an appropriate time.

Now, Senators CORKER and CARDIN should be commended for their tireless work to strike a compromise that should satisfy many of our colleagues—not all, but many. I know they worked with the White House to craft a bill that does not cut the legs out from underneath our negotiators as they work to finalize a deal with Iran, and I want to thank them for preserving the administration's ability to negotiate and the Congress's ability to weigh in on the final deal.

As we cast our votes on amendments and final passage of this bill, I would encourage us to consider the delicate nature of the compromise that Senators CORKER and CARDIN have struck.

Too often in Washington we focus on what divides us rather than what unites us. That is unfortunate and sometimes counterproductive for our country—not just on this issue but on a host of important policy matters. Compromise should not be a rare occurrence in our Nation's Capital. Rather, it should be one of our guiding principles.

We should seize this opportunity, colleagues, to advance a compromise that meets the needs of many of our colleagues, the President, and our Nation. I urge our colleagues to join me in supporting Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN's legislation.

Some of my colleagues have heard me say before, whenever I meet people who have been married for a long time, I love to ask those who have been married 50, 60, 70 years: What is the secret for being married 50, 60 or 70 years? I get a lot of different answers, as you might imagine. Some of them are very funny, and some are quite poignant.

Some of my favorites include a couple married over 50 years. I asked them not long ago: What is the secret to being married 50 years?

The wife said of her husband: He could be right or he could be happy, but he cannot be both.

More recently, with a couple who has been married over 60 years, I asked the husband and wife: What is the secret to being married over 60 years? And each of them gave a different answer. The wife said patience, and her husband of 60 years said a good sense of humor. That is pretty good advice as well.

I have asked this question hundreds of times over the years, but the best advice I have ever heard in asking that question is years ago from the answers of a couple who had been married 65 years or so.

I said: What is the secret of being married 65 years?

They both said almost at the same time: The two C's.

The two C's. I had never heard that one before.

I said: What are the two C's?

One of them said: Communicate.

That is good.

The other one said: Compromise.

Those are two pretty good C's.

Since then, I have invoked their words any number of times, including on this floor and here in Washington, DC, and in my own State of Delaware.

Over the years, I have added a third C to it. The third C is collaborate—collaborate. If you think about it, those two C's or those three C's—communicate, compromise, and collaborate—are not just the secret for a vibrant and long marriage between two people; they are also the secret to a vibrant democracy.

As one of the Members of this body, I wish to again express my thanks to Senators CORKER and CARDIN for communicating, for compromising, and for collaborating in a way that could bring about a better future for my kids, your kids, our grandchildren, and hopefully for the people of Iran and a lot of other nations that have a real interest in this issue—as we say in Delaware, a dog in this fight.

As I close, I thank you for this opportunity to speak today. I hope when we vote next week we will reward the efforts of those Senators with the two C's—CARDIN and CORKER—and further embrace the three C's—communicating, compromising, and collaborating—embrace their efforts with an “aye” vote.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FDA TOBACCO DEEMING REGULATIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, technology can be transformative. The black rotary phones have given way to iPhones. Sunlight and wind have become electricity. Camera tripods have

begotten selfie sticks. There are certain things, however, that do not need to be reimagined, repurposed or redesigned. There are items that serve no societal benefit whatsoever.

Example No. 1, the cigarette. Yet new cigarettes have exploded into the marketplace, known as everything from e-cigs to advanced nicotine delivery systems, to vaporizers. Similar to many emerging technologies, these products are designed to appeal to young people, and are more accessible to young people, and are explicitly marketed to young people, and because of this, we are being forced to write another dark chapter in the history books.

After more than four decades of research, there are several incontrovertible facts. Nicotine is addictive. It affects brain development, and in combination with tobacco, it is responsible for claiming millions of lives. These facts are true and were true decades ago, at the same time that Big Tobacco willfully, consistently, publicly, and falsely denied them.

Today, e-cigarette sales in the United States alone top \$1 billion. The use of e-cigarettes among middle and high school students tripled from 2013 to 2014, accounting for upward of 13 percent of high school students. New data reports that nearly 2.5 million American young people currently use e-cigarettes.

This data is not at all surprising when we consider the way these nicotine delivery products are targeted at young people and how these products are available in a myriad of flavors from cotton candy to vanilla cupcakes, to Coca-Cola. Strawberry-flavored vape liquid can contain just as much nicotine, and sometimes more, as a traditional cigarette.

We know from years of research that flavors attract young people, and the younger a person is when they start tobacco use, the more difficult it will be for them to quit. That is why Congress explicitly banned the use of cigarettes with flavors like cherry and bubble gum because of their appeal to young people.

Over the past decade, we have made great strides educating children and teens about the dangers of smoking. We cannot allow e-cigarettes to snuff out the progress we have made preventing nicotine addiction and its deadly consequences.

E-cigarette use is growing as fast as the students who are using them, and we need to put in place the rules to ensure that we stop it. First, we need to ban the marketing of e-cigarettes to young people in the United States. Second, we need to ban the use of flavorings. The use of fruit- and candy-based flavors is clearly meant to attract children. Cherry Crush e-cigarettes pose the same addiction risk as the minty Kools of the 1970s. Third, we should ban online sales of e-cigarettes. The FDA should prevent online sales of these devices to keep the product out

of the hands of children. Finally, last week marked 1 year since the FDA proposed long-overdue regulations to govern e-cigarettes. This is the first step to making sure children and teens can be protected from the harms of these devices. But 1 year later, these rules still have not been finalized. Until they are, new cigarettes will continue to target young people with appealing marketing, advertising, and product flavoring. Every day the FDA fails to act is another day young Americans can fall prey to harmful products pushed by the tobacco industry.

Last year, at a commerce committee hearing, I asked several e-cigarette company leaders to commit to ceasing the sale of these types of flavored products, and a few of them agreed, but the vast majority have not and will not stop this marketing campaign.

Today's electronic cigarettes are no better than the Joe Camels of the past because e-cigarettes, children, and teens do not mix. Young people are getting addicted to nicotine and putting their health and their futures at grave risk. It is time for the FDA to step in and stop the sale of these candy-flavored poisons, especially to the children of the United States.

My father started smoking two packs of Camels when he was 13 years of age. It was the cool thing to do. My father died from lung cancer. The tobacco industry denied that there was any linkage between tobacco and smoking and cancer and death. My father died from it. He started smoking at age 13 because it was the cool thing to do. Once you are addicted at the age of 13, 14 or 15 and smoking two packs of Joe Camels a day, it is hard to stop.

Here is something else we know: If a young person doesn't start to smoke until they are 19, they are highly unlikely to start at all because they have reached beyond the point where it is attractive to them from a peer pressure perspective. So what do these companies have to do? These companies have to find a way to market to young people by giving them flavored e-cigarettes and making it appealing to them because they have to get them when they are 13, 14, 15, and 16 years old. That is the marketing plan.

It has always been the marketing plan since my father started smoking when he was 13. He would say to me: Eddie, you have no idea how hard it is to stop. You have no idea how much I need to smoke and how much I need the nicotine. You could see it. He started when he was a kid, and that is the way it begins because people don't start smoking when they are 20 years of age. We all know that. Everyone listening to me knows that, and that is why this marketing campaign is so invidious. That is why what they are doing plays right into what we have known for a century is the business plan of the tobacco industry.

I urge the FDA to act. I urge the Members of this body to rise up to ensure that we do not have another gen-

eration that suffers the same fate as the previous generations have, in fact, had to live with, which is this addiction that was given to them at a very young age.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the opportunity to speak this afternoon, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I echo the voices of my friends and colleagues, the Senators from Oregon, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Rhode Island in calling on the FDA to act with all possible speed to issue final rules on regulating e-cigarettes. I want to thank especially my friend from Oregon, Senator MERKLEY, and my friend from California, Senator BOXER, who have been real leaders on this issue.

The Federal Government has an imperative to protect the public from dangerous products with commonsense restrictions. E-cigarettes are no exception. Their use among middle schoolers and high schoolers has skyrocketed—tripled among high schoolers according to a recent National Youth Tobacco Survey—and their risks are numerous.

E-cigarettes contain liquid nicotine, an addictive chemical which can impede brain development when consumed at a young age.

And these liquid nicotine containers are often sold without child protection caps in many parts of the country—and there have been far too many tragedies already of young children accidentally ingesting liquid nicotine. In Fort Plain, in upstate New York, a toddler of 18 months lost his life in such an accident—a terrible tragedy for two young parents. It is what propelled my home State to pass a requirement that all these liquid nicotine bottles be sold with child protection caps.

But, as my colleagues pointed out, the companies that sell these e-cigarettes are largely unregulated at the Federal level. In terms of Federal policy, e-cigarette companies are not even barred from selling to minors under the age of 18. So they market to children—on TV and on billboards and with child-friendly labels and flavors. According to a 2014 study, e-cigarette marketing exposure to children from 12 to 17 years old increased by 256 percent between 2011 and 2013. The FDA needs to be the adult in the room and put an end to these cynical marketing ploys. The FDA, including the new commissioner, seem ready and eager to use the Tobacco Deeming Rule to regulate e-cigarettes under the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. We strongly support their posture, but we need them to strengthen and finalize these rules. It is time for the FDA to put our children first and promulgate these rules.

Just yesterday, 31 prominent national organizations including, Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, Trust for America's Health, the American Lung Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics, sent a letter to the President asking the FDA to finalize

these regulations. Cigarette use has drastically declined in the last decade and we have made great strides in educating children about their harmful effects. E-cigarettes, with their misleading and trendy marketing, are threatening to set back that progress. Now it is time to snuff out the tactics that try to put kids on the path to smoking.

Mr. MARKEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DR. GORDON J. CHRISTENSEN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is an honor today to pay tribute to a renowned educator and a highly regarded prosthodontist, Dr. Gordon J. Christensen. Dr. Christensen has had a meaningful impact on dentistry across the Nation, and he continues to influence the field today through his wide-reaching publications.

Appropriately, the board of directors of the CR Foundation will be honoring Dr. Christensen for his contributions to the field at its upcoming 40th Anniversary Celebration on May 8, 2015.

Born on November 10, 1936, Gordon Christensen completed pre dental studies at Utah State University in 1956 and received a DDS degree at the University of Southern California in 1960. He completed a master's degree in restorative dentistry at the University of Washington in 1963 and earned a PhD in higher education and psychology at the University of Denver in 1972. Dr. Christensen has also received honorary doctorate degrees from Utah State University and Utah Valley University.

In 1976, Dr. Christensen and his wife, Dr. Rella Christensen—a well-respected dental consultant—started Clinical Research Associates, now known as the CR Foundation. He is presently serving as CR's chief executive officer and is a member of the board of directors. Dr. Christensen and his wife volunteer full-time for CR to conduct research in all areas of dentistry.

The Christensens publish the findings of their research in the Gordon J. Christensen Clinicians Report, a publication of the CR Foundation. The Clinicians Report is translated in 7 lan-

guages and distributed to more than 100,000 dentists across 92 countries. The Christensens have developed an expansive readership, and their groundbreaking research has positively impacted the dental health of hundreds of thousands of patients worldwide. Dental professionals who subscribe to Clinicians Report are unreserved in their praise of Dr. Christensen. I would like to share some of the appreciation Dr. Christensen recently received from three dental professionals. Richard K. Dimsdale, DDS, wrote: "Dentistry would never have made the advances it has over many years without the help, guidance, & research you have contributed!" Ted Cross, DDS, wrote: "The Gordon J. Christensen Clinicians Report has not only saved me tens of thousands of dollars of purchasing mistakes, but has also immeasurably improved the care my staff and I offer our patients." And Bob Dolan, DDS, wrote: "I recently retired after 54 years of practice. I believe I have been in contact with Gordon for 20 or 30 or more years and have really appreciated the great-unbiased information. Thank you Gordon (and your dear wife) for all you have done for me and for dentistry these many years."

Dr. Christensen also founded and directs Practical Clinical Courses, PCC, in Utah, an international continuing education organization providing courses and videos for dental professionals. In connection with PCC, he has presented over 45,000 hours of continuing education throughout the world.

As a frequent contributor to professional journals, Dr. Christensen holds editorial positions with 10 dental publications. He is also the recipient of many fellowships, masterships, and diplomas from various dental specialties and organizations worldwide.

Early in his career, Dr. Christensen helped initiate the University of Kentucky and the University of Colorado Dental Schools. He also taught dentistry courses at the University of Washington.

For the Christensens, dentistry seems to run in the family. Both of Dr. Christensen's sons work in the field: William is a prosthodontist and Michael is a general dentist. The Christensens' lovely daughter, Carlene, is making her own contributions as a teacher.

After more than 55 years in private practice, Dr. Christensen remains active in treating patients. He continues to influence dentistry across the world through his continuing education lectures and the Clinicians Report. He is truly one of dentistry's great leaders, and it is with great respect, gratitude, admiration, and affection that I pay tribute to Dr. Gordon J. Christensen.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEVADA APPEAL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Nevada Appeal newspaper.

May 16, 2015, marks 150 years since E.F. McElwain, J. Barrett, Marshall Robinson, and editor Henry Rust Mighels published the first issue of the Carson Daily Appeal in Nevada's State capital, Carson City. Nevada had recently joined the Union, and the Daily Appeal soon began reporting on the important issues facing the newly established State.

For 150 years, the paper has demonstrated its resilience and withstood a number of name changes and owners. One notable owner was Henry Mighels' widow, Nellie Verrill Mighels, who inherited the publication following Henry's death in 1879. Covering local politics and a popular boxing match, Nellie earned her place among the Appeal's journalists. Though her ownership of the paper was short-lived, she propelled the paper forward during her tenure.

Today, the Appeal remains the longest continually running newspaper in Nevada and is among the oldest businesses in Carson City. Decades of committed staff and dedicated local readers have kept this important publication and piece of Nevada history alive. I applaud the Nevada Appeal on its 150 years of quality journalism and wish the paper much continued success for years to come.

REMEMBERING REX CARR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to pay my respects to a man who championed the underdogs of Metro East, IL. Rex Carr passed away on Monday at the age of 88. For over one-half century, people who were out of luck or injured could call on Rex Carr to be their champion. He did it with a style and grace that made him a legend in the community.

Rex grew up in my hometown of East St. Louis. He was the second youngest of five boys. His mother was a teacher and father was a firefighter with the Illinois Central Railroad. His family could not afford much and often had to move when they could not pay the rent. When Rex graduated from East St. Louis High School, he joined the Navy and served in the Pacific Theater during World War II.

Rex would go on to attend college and law school at the University of Illinois. During summers, he worked filling freight cars with ice and hitched a ride back and forth between home and the University of Illinois.

In 1949, Rex finished law school and started practicing in East St. Louis. He was so poor that his first office was in the chambers of a friendly judge, where he could only work when the judge was busy in court. He earned \$500 his first year of practice. But he would keep an office in East St. Louis for the rest of his life.

In Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird*, Atticus Finch defined courage, "When you know you're licked before you begin but you begin anyway and you see it through no matter what."

You rarely win, but sometimes you do.” Rex did not win all his cases, but he won quite a few and always tried to see things to their end. Rex had that courage that Atticus Finch described.

During the 1960s and 1970s, Rex earned a reputation as a civil rights and labor attorney. He fiercely fought for equal rights for African Americans and represented teachers in East St. Louis.

By the end of the 1970s, Rex’s practice had turned toward personal injury, and he became a legend. He won national acclaim as the best-prepared lawyer in Metro East and even made it into the Guinness Book of Records for three categories: the longest civil jury trial; the largest personal injury verdict at the time; and the largest libel verdict.

The longest trial also was one of his proudest moments of his career. A tanker car carrying wood preservative with a dioxin contaminant spilled in Sturgeon, MO, injuring many of the town’s residents. He represented 65 of them. All but one of the parties settled with the residents. Chemical giant Monsanto, manufacturer of the dioxin, refused, and Rex took them to court.

Rex fought for three and a half years in the case. There were 182 witnesses, 6,000 separate exhibits, and over 100,000 pages in transcript. Rex’s skill was on full display. He cross-examined a witness for 6 months and then another witness for 5 months. The jury awarded the plaintiffs \$16 million. An appeals court would disappoint him and the residents by reducing the award to \$1 million.

Rex went on to win many cases and mentor many young lawyers in Metro East. His career was about holding corporations responsible and ensuring his clients’ rights. Rex’s cross-examinations were the stuff of folklore. At 88 years old, he was still working out of his Missouri Avenue office in East St. Louis. It’s where he was from, and he wanted people to be able to come to him for help.

Rex was a giant in Metro East. My thoughts and prayers go out to his four sons, Rex G. Carr of Vermont, Bruce Carr of Valparaiso, IN, Eric Reeve of Mack’s Creek, MO, and Glenn Carr of Columbia, IL; a daughter, Kathryn Marie Wheeler of Los Angeles, CA; 16 grandchildren; and 20 great-grandchildren.

THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Last week, the Senate considered a very important amendment to S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Senator COLLINS and I offered amendment No. 290, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, which was cosponsored by Senators AYOTTE, MURKOWSKI, BALDWIN, HEITKAMP, SHAHEEN, BENNET, MURPHY, MERKLEY, SCHATZ, KLOBUCHAR, and BOOKER.

As we crafted this legislation, Senator COLLINS and I listened to the stories of survivors of human trafficking and the service providers who help them rebuild their lives. So many of these stories began with a homeless or runaway teen, scared and alone, and in need of a safe place to sleep. These young people were completely vulnerable, and traffickers preyed upon their desperation. Survivors and service providers underscored the importance of preventing human trafficking from happening in the first place by reauthorizing the critical programs funded by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

With their feedback in mind, we crafted S. 262, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. We made important updates to ensure that homeless youth service providers are specifically trained to recognize victims of trafficking, address their unique traumas, and refer them to appropriate and caring services.

Our bill will improve services for these vulnerable children in several ways. We lengthen the time that youth can stay in shelters from 21 days to 30 days, so they are better able to find stable housing. Kids who are forced out of shelters and back onto the streets before they are ready are more likely to become victims of exploitation. Our bill prioritizes suicide prevention services and family reunification efforts and expands aftercare services. Providers know that such measures save children’s lives and help them build a more stable future with families and trusted adults. Under our bill, service providers will collect data on the demographics of youth who are served by their shelters to help understand their needs and refine their services. It encourages grantees to examine the connection between youth who are victims of trafficking and any previous involvement in the foster care system or juvenile justice system in order to address the causes of youth homelessness. It further requires staff training on how to help youth apply for Federal student loans to help make college possible for youth so they can build a more stable future.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act also includes a crucial nondiscrimination provision that would prevent discrimination against youth based on their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation or disability. We offered this important legislation as amendment No. 290 to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

We were very disappointed that it received only 56 votes and failed to garner the 60 votes necessary for passage, but we are encouraged that it received a strong bipartisan vote from a majority of the Senate. I want to thank the 54 other Senators who voted for this legislation: Senators AYOTTE, BALDWIN, BENNET, BLUMENTHAL, BOOKER, BOXER, BROWN, CANTWELL, CAPITO, CARDIN,

CARPER, CASEY, COONS, DONNELLY, DURBIN, FEINSTEIN, FRANKEN, GILLIBRAND, HEINRICH, HEITKAMP, HELLER, HIRONO, KAINE, KING, KIRK, KLOBUCHAR, MANCHIN, MARKEY, MCCASKILL, MENENDEZ, MERKLEY, MIKULSKI, MURKOWSKI, MURPHY, MURRAY, NELSON, PAUL, PETERS, PORTMAN, REED, REID, SANDERS, SCHATZ, SCHUMER, SHAHEEN, STABENOW, SULLIVAN, TESTER, TOOMEY, UDALL, WARNER, WARREN, WHITEHOUSE, and WYDEN. We appreciate their support and their dedication to working to prevent vulnerable youth from becoming victims of human trafficking.

I especially applaud Senators COLLINS, HEITKAMP, AYOTTE, and MURKOWSKI for their help fighting to get a vote on this amendment. Their leadership on this issue is exceptional, and the Senate is better for having them as Members.

I also want to thank the tireless advocates who have worked so hard to help us improve the bill and urge support for the effort: Darla Bardine, with National Network for Youth; Jennifer Pike and David Stacy, with Human Rights Campaign; Cyndi Lauper and Gregory Lewis, with the True Colors Fund; Bridget Petruczok and Laura Durso, with the Center for American Progress; Melysa Sperber, with the Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking; Holly Austin Smith, Jayne Bigelsen, and Kevin Ryan, with Covenant House; Calvin Smith and Kreig Pinkham, with the Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs; Erin Albright, with Give Way to Freedom; Griselda Vega, with Safe Horizon; Susan Burton, with the United Methodist Church; and the many others who provided us with their feedback as we drafted this important legislation. They are the true experts in this field and their insights and contributions were invaluable.

This is not the end for the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. As I have said time and again, we must protect the most vulnerable among us, and we must do everything we can to prevent the heinous crime of human trafficking from occurring. It is vital that we update and reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. We will continue to fight to see the passage of the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act.

THANKING AMERICAN DIPLOMATS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to take a moment to honor the American diplomats who serve our country. Specifically, I want to thank the American diplomats who have been on the front lines working for America throughout the Iran nuclear P5+1 negotiations. They address so many vital issues on a daily basis, some of which we hear about in the news but many of which never reach the headlines.

The Corker-Cardin bill is now on the floor, addressing the role of Congress in a final deal with Iran. I hope there will

be deliberative, thorough debate around this important issue. I want to put aside the partisan bellowing and grandstanding, some of which has regrettably stooped to impugn our diplomats, and rather take a moment to recognize our diplomats for their efforts to find peaceful solutions to the Iranian nuclear menace that threatens the world.

For 2 years, America's diplomats have labored quietly, with no aspiration for personal accolade, to represent our Nation's best interests and build the foundation for a possible P5+1 agreement with Iran. The United States has had little contact with Iran since 1979, but their shrewdness and duplicity at the negotiating table is well known. It has been a huge task with no certainty of outcome. There have been innumerable hurdles. There have been many setbacks, and there will be more. But our diplomats have stayed steady, focused on the task at hand.

Diplomacy is about understanding strategic motivations, applying fact and science to argument, and maintaining an unwavering commitment to American values and interests throughout complex talks with an untrustworthy and difficult foe. America's diplomats have done so with focus and integrity.

During the negotiations, American diplomats have also been supported and informed by a tremendous cadre of American experts: scientists, intelligence professionals, civilian experts, members of the military and academics. This process has been a collective effort that has drawn on the country's best and brightest.

There was once a time when politics ended at the water's edge, but in recent years we have seen the erosion of that principle and, instead, a rise in the practice of subsuming the interests of the country to tactical political objectives. The leadership of our diplomats is critical and needed now more than ever, and I want them to know—we value and appreciate you. Regardless of what you might think of the talks in the first place, the dedication of America's diplomats has made us all proud. For that, I thank them.

TRIBUTE TO MEAGHAN MCCARTHY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a devoted public servant and tireless friend of the people of Washington State as she moves on from the staff of the United States Senate. Meaghan McCarthy has dedicated nearly 13 years in service to the Appropriations Committee and is widely recognized for her expertise in housing policy. I know that back in Washington State, here in the Senate, and across the country—Ms. McCarthy's important work has helped so many people find affordable housing and get back on their feet. I know so many will miss her compassionate advocacy on behalf of those facing housing challenges, from veterans requiring

supportive housing, to working-class families that need a helping hand to remain in safe and affordable homes, and so many more.

A Massachusetts native and graduate of Notre Dame and Johns Hopkins University, Ms. McCarthy began her career in public policy as an advocate for children, working at the Children's Defense Fund. She then joined the Appropriations Committee as professional staff, where she developed a keen understanding of complex Federal housing policy. As a top staff member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, Ms. McCarthy has overseen and helped fund key affordable housing supports that make sure millions of people across the country have access to high-quality affordable housing. From tenant vouchers provided through the section 8 program to homeless assistance grants, supportive HUD-VASH vouchers for our veterans, and public housing funds, Ms. McCarthy has worked hand-in-hand with housing officials in my State to make sure Washington State families receive the resources they need.

It is so clear to me that Washington State has benefited from Ms. McCarthy's hard work, vast knowledge, and compassion for people and families fighting to make ends meet. During my time as the subcommittee's chair, I was always thankful that she was working on my State's behalf. Many of our housing advocates and authorities have reached out to my office to express their appreciation for her work. They have called her a "critical bridge between Washington state's communities and our nation's big-picture, broad-stroke policy and budget machinery," someone who translated real-world neighborhood needs into action in a complex Federal bureaucracy.

Ms. McCarthy's work has had real and measurable impacts in Washington State communities. Stephen Norman, the executive director of the King County Housing Authority, was kind enough to share an anecdote wherein Ms. McCarthy pioneered a program to fund community facilities adjacent to public housing, which he called "a cross-cutting initiative that recognized the importance of education success for low income children and the opportunities created by partnering schools and Housing Authorities." When HUD's draft rules effectively excluded suburban communities, which require a network of smaller facilities, Ms. McCarthy did what she does best: she went to work to solve the problem and change the rules. And change them she did. Now, King County has a network of 14 youth facilities, serving some of the poorest families in the region and helping children to reach their potential and to realize their dreams.

Today I join with others throughout the country, the State of Washington, and this body in thanking Ms. McCarthy for her years of service. I congratulate her on all of her accomplishments

and wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

WORLD PRESS FREEDOM DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I commemorate World Press Freedom Day 2015 on May 3, 2015—a day reserved to celebrate the value of freedom of press and the critical role it serves in creating a more free and open society. In its highest forms, the press does not simply inform, but brings attention to atrocities around the world, provides checks on authoritarian governments, and catalyzes better governance.

The United States has recognized the great value of freedom of the press from its inception and in its Declaration of Universal Rights, the United Nations acknowledged the profound role of this fundamental right. On May 3, 1991, in the Windhoek Declaration, the U.N. recommitted itself to this important cause with a call to arms to protect the right of the press "to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

A pluralistic and free press is essential to the development and maintenance of democracy as well as economic development. According to Freedom House's 2014 Freedom of the Press Index, only 14 percent of the world's citizens live in countries that enjoy a free press. In every other corner of the world, freedom of the press is threatened by governments that want to restrict freedom of expression and association by harassing and intimidating journalists. According to Reporters Without Borders, 69 journalists and 19 citizen journalists were killed in 2014 in connection with their collection and dissemination of news and information, and the Committee to Protect Journalists, found that in that same year the 3 deadliest countries for journalists on assignment were Syria, Ukraine, and Iraq. Today we honor all journalists who have been imprisoned or killed while seeking to tell a story that deserves to be told and needs to be heard.

The weekend of April 25 marked the 1-year anniversary of the arrest of three independent journalists and six bloggers in Ethiopia known as the "Zone 9 bloggers." The reporters, who published articles criticizing the government, have been charged under Ethiopia's Anti-Terrorism Proclamation, seemingly in connection with their writings. They remain in jail to this day, their trial once again postponed until after the Ethiopian elections. Unfortunately, this sort of imprisonment is not an isolated incident in Ethiopia. According to Human Rights Watch, Ethiopia has the second largest number of journalists in exile and the largest number of imprisoned journalists and bloggers in all of sub-Saharan Africa.

I and a number of my colleagues wrote Secretary Kerry in March about our ongoing concern with efforts by the

Ethiopian government to restrict freedom of speech and association in Ethiopia. In recent months numerous media publications have closed amid widespread harassment, and the Ethiopian government continues to control most television and radio broadcasting content. Today, I again urge the Ethiopian government to respect freedom of expression and freedom of the press—especially in advance of the May 24 elections. Anti-terrorism laws must not be used for political gain or to stifle the expression of dissenting political views.

The continued imprisonment of Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian, who remains in Iran on alleged espionage charges, is another example of the immense duress that journalists around the world endure. Mr. Rezaian, an esteemed and respected professional journalist, has been imprisoned in Tehran since July 22. As the United States and Iran continue to negotiate a nuclear agreement, it is important that we not forget about Jason Rezaian, an Iranian-American who deserves to be free.

And, finally, the world will never forget the brutal and barbaric murder of American reporter James Foley by the Islamic State this past summer. His death reminds us that it is not only oppressive governments that threaten journalists, but terrorist organizations as well. Foley's life's work chronicling the war torn countries of Afghanistan and Syria speaks to a deep commitment to the truth, a desire to tell the story of the world's most vulnerable and the right to freedom of the press even in the gravest of circumstances. This is what freedom of the press is all about.

As witnesses to the good that free press provides to society and the threat that it faces, we have a responsibility to stand against injustice, to tell the stories of these brave journalists and others in the hopes of securing their freedom and preventing future tragedies from occurring. As George Mason said in 1776, "The freedom of the press is one of the greatest bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic governments." On World Press Freedom Day 2015, the United States and governments around the world must recommit themselves to protecting press freedom in order to enable democracy to flourish and good governance to prevail.

NATIONAL OUTDOOR LEADERSHIP SCHOOL 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this year we commemorate the 50th anniversary of NOLS, the National Outdoor Leadership School. What started in Wyoming has now grown to 14 locations worldwide on six continents. NOLS locations stretch from the fjords of Norway and the Indian Himalayas to the Yukon and east Africa.

In the last 50 years there have been over 250,000 graduates ranging in ages

from 14 to over 70 years old. They come from all walks of life, from all 50 States, and numerous countries around the world. They come to learn mountaineering, kayaking, horse packing, sailing, backcountry skiing, caving, and wilderness medicine skills, just to name a few.

As a doctor, I appreciate the importance NOLS places on outdoor medicine. The Wyss Wilderness Medicine Campus was designed and located to create an optimal learning environment for students of wilderness medicine. At the campus, classroom experience extends to the outdoors with real-life simulations in wild and realistic terrain.

I find it very appropriate NOLS has its beginning in Wyoming. Like Wyoming, NOLS supports a diverse economic portfolio that benefits from energy, agriculture, hunting and fishing, tourism, and outdoor recreation and education. Wyoming and NOLS both work towards a balanced approach to natural resource management that provides opportunities for a diversified energy portfolio while caring for Wyoming's world-class wildlife and wild places.

One need not look any further than Lander, WY, for an example of balanced natural resource management. Lander is home to NOLS and gateway to the Wind River Range. At times, Lander has been a steel town and a supply hub during the gold boom. Today, Lander continues to be rich with energy and agricultural production.

Wyoming and NOLS have shared strong leaders who work to find pragmatic and inclusive solutions to land management challenges. John Gans is one of those leaders. John has successfully carried on the tradition established by Paul Petzoldt, the founder of NOLS. After 20 years at the helm, he is the longest serving executive director of NOLS. Under John Gans' leadership, NOLS has been recognized nine times as one of the best places to work for. In 2012, he was recognized as a White House Champion of Change for his commitment to youth, wilderness and leadership.

While NOLS' international programs have grown immensely during his time, John values the connections that exist between the town of Lander, NOLS staff, and graduates. Phil Nicholas, Marc Randolph, and Tori McClure are just a few examples of many graduates who have gone on to become successful businesspeople, educators, and leaders in the community and the Nation. Phil Nicholas is the current Wyoming Senate president and a former NOLS instructor. Tori McClure was the first woman to row solo across the Atlantic Ocean and the first woman to ski to the South Pole. Marc Randolph is a Co-founder of Netflix.

One of the things that make NOLS alumni so successful is they have learned how to make decisions and face adversity. NOLS students suffer

through extreme heat and cold and all types of weather conditions. NOLS students make decisions with consequences, and they apply these lessons to their lives. They come home with a new perspective on the world around them and their role within it.

In this day and age of selfies and instant gratification, we need more people—and especially the youth—to realize they may not be the center of the universe. A perspective of hard work, sacrifice, and an appreciation and respect for nature needs to be taught and needs to be learned. In previous generations, this perspective was provided on family farms and ranches across the country. Gratefully, thanks to all the hard work and dedication of the NOLS staff, NOLS courses continue to provide this perspective to future leaders. I am confident in the future leadership of our communities and Nation because I know tomorrow's leaders are receiving NOLS instruction and experience today.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the National Outdoor Leadership School on their 50th anniversary. We are looking forward to another 50 years of success.

RECOGNIZING FUTURE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor 423 high school seniors in 8 Northeast Ohio counties for their decision to enlist in the U.S. Armed Forces. Of these 423 seniors from 120 high schools in 105 towns and cities, 97 will enter the Army, 127 will enter the Marine Corps, 42 will enter the Navy, 24 will enter the Air Force, 3 will enter the Coast Guard, 123 will enter our Ohio Army National Guard, and 7 will enter the Ohio Air National Guard. In the presence of their parents/guardians, high school counselors, military leaders, and city and business leaders, all 423 will be recognized on May 6, 2015, by Our Community Salutes of Northeast Ohio.

In a few short weeks, these young men and women will join with many of their classmates in celebration of their high school graduation. At a time when many of their peers are looking forward to pursuing vocational training or college degrees, or are uncertain about their future, these young men and women instead have chosen to dedicate themselves to military service in defense of our rights, our freedoms, and our country. They should know that they have the full support of this Senate Chamber and the American people, who are with them in whatever challenges may lie ahead.

These 423 young men and women are the cornerstone of our liberties. It is thanks to their dedication and the dedication of an untold number of patriots just like them that we are able to meet here today, in the Senate, and openly debate the best solutions to the many diverse problems that confront

our country. It is thanks to their sacrifices that the United States of America remains a beacon of hope and freedom in a dangerous world. We are grateful to them, and we are grateful to their parents and their communities for instilling in them not only the mental and physical abilities our Armed Forces require, but also the character, the values, and the discipline that lead someone to put service to our Nation over self.

I would like to personally thank these 423 graduating seniors for volunteering to risk their lives in defense of our Nation. We owe them, along with all those who serve our country, a deep debt of gratitude.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of the 423 high school seniors.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMY—97

Abrams—Cleveland; Apathy—Brook Park; Ashford—Maple Heights; Axford—Elyria; Ballew—Akron; Barnett—Akron; Barton—Ravenna; Bate-Keck—Garfield Heights; Beckwith—Madison; Berry—Strongsville; Best—Bay Village; Black—Cleveland; Bodi—Parma; Borkowski—Akron; Brown—Elyria; Bures—Medina; Chesek—North Royalton; Colon—Parma; Corcino—Lorain; Currence—Geneva; Daley—Olmsted Township; Farmer—Cleveland; Fernandez—Bay Village; Fields—Ravenna; Forcier—Mantua; Garcia—Kilrain—Elyria; Gargas—Amherst; Gerez—Garrettsville; Gibson—Conneaut; Goan—Lakewood; Griffie—Brook Park; Gronowski—Parma; Grzelak—Barberton; Guest—Elyria; Hadden—Garfield Heights; Hathaway—Ravenna; Haught—Lorain; Heiser—Strongsville; Hill—Norton; Johnson—Akron; Jordan—Maple Heights; Kaur—Solon; Kerestly—Seville; Kessler—Wadsworth; Klimavicius—Garfield Heights; Lacey—Aurora; Lambert—Medina; Lemasters—Diamond; Leon Gonzalez—Lorain; Lindsey—Lyndhurst.

Loughridge—Brunswick; Lyons—Ravenna; Madeja—Cleveland; Marizek—Painesville; McGaha—Ravenna; Meacham—Akron; Miller—Parma; Mitchell—Brooklyn; Mitchell—Ravenna; Montas Correa—Elyria; Murphy—Painesville; Olavarria—Ashtabula; Palmer—Grafton; Privara—Barberton; Ray—Akron; Razo—Painesville; Reese—Cuyahoga Falls; Reinhardt—Amherst; Rhinehardt—Twinsburg; Rigda—North Olmsted; Rubsam—Brook Park; Ryman—Akron; Salvage—Strongsville; Sams—Wellington; Schoen—Medina; Shahan—Mantua; Sherrill—Elyria; Shorter—Wadsworth; Shumaker—Wellington; Simmons—Berea; Slusher—Mentor; Smiley—Cleveland; Steele—Cleveland; Storey—Chesterland; Szabo—Elyria; Torres—Cleveland; Tryon—Copley; Turley—Cleveland; Van Horn—Cleveland; Vong—Elyria; West—Cleveland; Wiley—Lorain; Williams—Solon; Wilson—Olmsted Falls; Winston—North Olmsted; Witherspoon—Olmsted Township; Zurowski—Macedonia.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS—127

Abbenhaus—Brook Park; Angeles—Ballesteros—Solon; Bish—Streetsboro; Bodjanac—Stow; Boesken—Olmsted Falls; Brown—Cleveland; Brown—Lorain; Caraballo—Berea; Casey—Geneva; Choby—Concord Township; Christoff—Stow; Cook—Middlefield; Cool—Wadsworth; Cooney—Geneva; Cooper—Akron; Criddle—Akron; Cummings—Bedford; Curtis—Aurora; Dabney—

Cleveland; Dautartus—Parma; Davis—Cleveland; Dean—Vermilion; Denton—Brunswick; Dolly—Kent; Douangpanya—Akron; Drope—Garfield Heights; Dudley—Akron; Estremera—Strongsville; Fatica—Willoughby; Faupelcresong—Uniontown; Fleshman—Akron; Folley—Lorain; Forrester—Akron; Fox—Grafton; Garrett—Akron; Garrow—Columbia Station.

Geiss—Brunswick; Gilbert—Painesville; Gingell—Cleveland; Grimmett—Akron; Gump—Elyria; Haas—Copley; Hamilton—Hudson; Hathaway—Akron; Hawkins—Doylestown; Headen—Stow; Herrlinger—Akron; Hoover—Brunswick; Hopkins—Brunswick; Howes—Vermilion; Huff—Elyria; Huff—Solon; Huston—Brooklyn; Jackson—Chardon; Jennings—Hartville; Jerse—Cleveland; Johnson—Bedford Heights; Jones—Westlake; Jorgensen—South Euclid; Kellogg—Brunswick; Kelly—Medina; Kerestesy—Jefferson; Kinds—Cleveland Heights; Kravchuk—Mayfield; Ksajikyan—Parma; Lahtonen—Tallmadge; Lamatrice—Garfield Heights; Larson—Lakewood; Llamas—Painesville; Lowry—Eastlake; Lundmark—Bay Village; Lunsford—Cuyahoga Falls; Mariner—Parma; Marks—Geneva; Matejovich—Solon; McKenna—Elyria; Mencke—Austinburg; Midkiff—Amherst; Moore—Cleveland; Myers—Shaker Heights.

Nowak—Brunswick; Nyström—Euclid; Oberstar III—Ashtabula; O'Donnell—Lakewood; O'Keefe—Solon; O'Neill—Elyria; Payne—Parma; Peterson—Independence; Pilar—Homerville; Prosen—Peninsula; Rahe—Westlake; Rakovec—Painesville; Rall—Cleveland; Rios—Vermilion; Robishaw—Seville; Rosado—Cleveland; Sabo—Akron; Salyer—Chagrin Falls; Santi—Lakewood; Scott—Euclid; Seditz—Brook Park; Seredich—Strongsville; Smiechowski—Wadsworth; Smith—Cuyahoga Falls; Smith—Uniontown; Solon—Brook Park; Sprague—Mentor; Stergar—Lakewood; Stewart—Wellington; Susakheil—Parma; Swails—Painesville; Sylvester—Westlake; Tinch—Barberton; Trevino—Akron; Turkovich—Geneva; Turner—Mayfield; Van Pelt—Painesville; Vasquez—Lorain; Walters—Wellington; Weimer—Lodi; Whitney—Norton; Willett—Strongsville; Williams—Shaker Heights; Woodruff—North Olmsted; Wright—Rome; Zindash—Jefferson; Zuchowsky—Wadsworth.

UNITED STATES NAVY—42

Adorno, W.—Lorain; Adorno, Z.—Westlake; Ainsworth—North Ridgeville; Beebe—Ashtabula; Botez—Hartville; Cassity—Painesville; Darby—Cleveland; DeJesus—Northfield; Eddleman—Akron; Elliot—Uniontown; Esparza—Tallmadge; Giddens—Cleveland; Green—Cleveland; Hanna—Ashtabula; Hennessey—Bloomfield; Hutchinson—Cleveland; Johnson—Akron; Kobernik—Jefferson; Krendick—North Canton; Kusar—Kirtland; Maillis—Copley; Malon—Chardon; Marrero—Cleveland; Mayberry—Ashtabula; Miller—Elyria; Moore—Lorain; Morey—Solon; Morgan—Conneaut; Morrison—Akron; Navarro—Cleveland; Panteloukas—Cleveland; Pasko—Ashtabula; Patterson—Wadsworth; Pechatsko—Eastlake; Quaid—Medina; Root—Conneaut; Sayre—Akron; Scheier—Brunswick; Sutton—Orwell; Wallish—Northfield; Winters—Roaming Shores; Zahorai—Brunswick.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE—24

Burgess—Cleveland; Butcher—Madison; Dolan—Elyria; Duffield—Westlake; Dunstan—Elyria; Ewing—Elyria; Fitzgerald—Medina; Hill—South Euclid; Lewis—Mentor; Loper—Parma; Lunato, Jr.—Grafton; Merriweather—Wickliffe; Miranda—Elyria; Moran—Medina; Paalz—Berea; Richter—Eastlake; Rivera—Berea; Ryder—

Strongsville; Searight—Bedford; Smith—Bedford; Smith—Kirtland; Thomas—Madison; Washington—Berea; Yehl—Chardon.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD—3

Chiyam—Fairview Park; Mullis—Akron; Tryon—Eastlake.

OHIO ARMY NATIONAL GUARD—123

Abrams—Ashtabula; Alicea—Cleveland; Bascomb—Cleveland; Becker—Dorset; Bernardo—Ashtabula; Blackburn—Beachwood; Boston—Hartville; Brown—Shaker Heights; Brown—Ashtabula; Brown, Jr.—New Franklin; Burgos—Cleveland; Burks—Chagrin Falls; Camera—Wakeman; Cavett—Cleveland; Christian—Elyria; Collins—Richmond Heights; Crider—Maple Heights; Cronan—Hudson; Dean—Akron; Dennis—Twinsburg; Denson, Jr.—Barberton; Drawkulich—Springfield; Dvorak—Chagrin Falls; Eckenrode—Madison; Endsley—Amherst; Eshelman—Chagrin Falls; Evans—Richmond Heights; Flowers—Wakeman; Friend—Wellington; Frolo—North Royalton; Funk—Akron; Gautschi—Geneva; Gonzalez—Lorain; Gray—Lakewood; Greene—Twinsburg; Gruszka—Northfield; Guardo—Chardon; Guerra—Lakewood; Hammond—Berea; Hancock—Canton; Hensal—Clinton; Hernandez—Cleveland; Hernandez—Parma; Hodges—Strongsville; Hunt—Brooklyn; Hurtt—Cleveland; Jancik—Lakewood.

Johnson—Stow; Kirby—Mentor-on-the-Lake; Ladow—Ferguson—Akron; Leski—Avon; Lewis—Windham; Locklear—Cleveland; Losey—Painesville; Lostetter—Cuyahoga Falls; Maldonado—Cleveland; Mallory—Rome; Marino—South Euclid; Mason—Cleveland Heights; McEntee—Valley View; McGraw—Tallmadge; McMullen—LaGrange; Miller—Conneaut; Miller—Grafton; Miller—Wadsworth; Minor—Hudson; Mollick—Ashtabula; Moore—Barberton; Moore—Cleveland; Moore—Uniontown; Moreno—Cleveland; Mullins—Cleveland; Myers—Akron; Ness—Painesville; Novah—Avila—Brooklyn Heights; Novello—Burton; Ogden—Barberton; Panar, Jr.—Akron; Parsons—Elyria; Patterson—Elyria; Perkins—Jefferson; Plants—Ashtabula; Player—Cleveland.

Powers—Cleveland; Prater—Medina; Priem—Orwell; Pruitt—Garfield Heights; Raser—Mentor; Reinhart—Uniontown; Rinas—Olmsted Township; Rivers—Akron; Rondeau—North Olmsted; Rose—Elyria; Rowe—Hartville; Ruys—Olmsted Falls; Sanders, Jr.—Akron; Semak—Painesville Township; Shiner—Kent; Singh—Brooklyn; Smith—Akron; Somerville—Stow; Sporcich, Jr.—Ashtabula; Stallworth—Copley; Starling—Barberton; Stokes—Lakewood; Sturgill—Valley City; Sudyk—Painesville; Sundman—Rock Creek; Tabler—Cuyahoga Falls; Taylor, G.—Cleveland; Taylor, J.—Cleveland; Tester—Elyria; Thompson—Akron; Thompson—Cleveland; Turner—Cleveland; VanHorn—Elyria; Vaughn—Hudson; Wadesisi—Cleveland; Walls—Euclid; Weigel—Painesville; Wheeler—Hiram; Whitten—Lorain; Woodward—Akron.

OHIO AIR GUARD—7

Allen—Middleburg Heights; Birchler—Navarre; Day—Norton; Handwerk II—Medina; Little—Norwalk; Wehrmeyer—Ryan; Wooley—Boardman.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING JOANNE FARRIS

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate COL Joanne Farris on her recent selection as the first female brigade commander in the

history of the Nevada National Guard. Colonel Farris assumed command of the 991st Multi-Functional Brigade, overseeing more than 700 soldiers, including the Nevada Army Guard's aviation assets. It gives me great pleasure to recognize her achievement in this historic moment.

Colonel Farris joined the Guard over 25 years ago as a private first class and was later commissioned from the University of Nevada, Reno ROTC Program in 1991. She then continued her studies and earned her master's from Clayton College in 2004, the same year she graduated from the Commander and General Staff College. She is currently working towards completion of her second year of War College and is scheduled to graduate this summer.

Colonel Farris formerly commanded the 1-69th Press Camp Headquarters, which deployed to Bosnia in 1999. She also served as command information officer for the State of Nevada, 1-421st Regional Training Institute executive officer, Joint Force Headquarters commander, and as the Nevada Guard State family program director. In 2011, she deployed to Afghanistan with the 401st Army Field Support Brigade.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Colonel Farris for her courageous contributions to the United States of America. Her unwavering dedication to her career is commendable, and she stands as a role model to future generations of heroes. Colonel Farris' service to her country and her bravery earn her a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. Equally as important, it is crucial that female servicemembers and veterans have access to their specific health care needs. There are countless distinguished women who have made sacrifices beyond measure and deserve nothing but the best treatment. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation and will continue to fight until this becomes a reality.

During her tenure, Colonel Farris has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Nevada Guard. I am both humbled and honored by her service and am proud to call her a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Colonel Joanne Farris for all of her accomplishments and wish her well in all of her future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO JODY SHERVANICK

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize Jody Shervanick for her tireless efforts in supporting Nevada's veterans, active military mem-

bers, and their families. Ms. Shervanick volunteers 7 days a week to give back to the brave men and women who defend our freedom and their families. She has contributed greatly to the Las Vegas military community and to the greater good of the Silver State.

Having grown up as a military child, Ms. Shervanick understands the trials of a military family. She stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted her life to the betterment of others, selflessly serving to bring happiness to our Nation's heroes each day. It is important to thank not only the men and women serving this great Nation, but also their families who make so many sacrifices. Her service to these families is invaluable.

Ms. Shervanick helps with care for veterans and military members with mental illness, such as post-traumatic stress, and aids in times of uncertainty for military families, providing food, financial aid, and childcare. She hosts special events for families stationed at Creech and Nellis Air Force Bases. Ms. Shervanick coordinates the "World's Largest Baby Shower," for wives of active military or female members stationed at Creech and Nellis Air Force Bases, puts on multiple Christmas parties for the children at Nellis Air Force Base, spearheads an annual Easter party for the children at Nellis Air Force Base, and will be putting on a "Mom"ster and Son Halloween bash in October. I have had the opportunity to attend one of Ms. Shervanick's Operation Showers of Appreciation Military Baby Showers in Las Vegas, and I know firsthand the positive impact her efforts have on military families. She works with volunteers to make pillow slips for deployed military members with pictures of their children. Her commitment to these families is without limit. She is truly a role model to all Nevadans.

Ms. Shervanick's hard work has not gone without notice. She received "Citizen of the Month" from Mayor Carolyn Goodman of the city of Las Vegas in December 2014, a plaque recognizing her service from Governor Brian Sandoval, and has been recognized by News 3 KSNV, 8 News Now KLAS, and FOX 5 KVVU for her service to veterans and military families. I extend my deepest gratitude to Ms. Shervanick for her noble contributions to the Las Vegas military community. Her service to Nevada places her among the outstanding men and women of the State and her accolades are well deserved.

Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing Ms. Shervanick and her work with active military members, veterans, and their families. Her efforts are both honorable and necessary. I wish her the best of luck in all of her future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING LOUISIANA'S LEMONADE DAY

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, Saturday, May 2, 2015, marks the fifth an-

nual Louisiana Lemonade Day during which thousands of children across the Pelican State will start their own small business—a lemonade stand. This free, statewide program is dedicated to teaching children how to start, own, and operate their own business, and in the last 5 years, Lemonade Day has provided more than 50,000 children across Louisiana with the opportunity to become entrepreneurs.

On Lemonade Day, thousands of children will open their own lemonade stands and learn the crucial lessons of salesmanship, competition, and marketing. They will be introduced to crucial business skills, like supply and demand, critical thinking and problem solving, and civic responsibility. Lemonade Day encourages young entrepreneurs to save one-third of their profits, share one-third of their profits, and spend one-third of their profits. They are even urged to open a youth savings account. These simple, yet important lessons will shape future generations of business leaders, and hopefully, instill some good money-managing practices that will help them later in life.

The secret to America's success lies within the innovation and creativity of American entrepreneurs. Urging our Nation's youth to develop their big ideas is critical for securing the future of our country's economic stability. On its fifth anniversary, I would like to recognize Louisiana's Lemonade Day and the role it plays in fostering entrepreneurial spirits in the lives of our Nation's youths.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS SUPPORTING THE UNDERLYING OBJECTIVES OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION (THE "COMMISSION")—PM 15

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

My Administration fully supports the underlying objectives of the recommendations that the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (the "Commission") offered in January. These recommendations represent an important step forward in protecting the long-term viability of the All-Volunteer Force, improving quality-of-life for service members and their families, and ensuring the fiscal sustainability of the military compensation and retirement systems.

As I directed in my letter of March 30, my team has worked with the Commission to further analyze the recommendations and identify areas of agreement. At this time I am prepared to support specific proposals for 10 of the Commission's 15 recommendations, either as proposed or with modifications that have been discussed among the Department of Defense, other agencies, and the Commission. These include the following:

- Survivor Benefit Plan
- Financial Education
- Medical Personnel Readiness
- Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Collaboration
- Child Care
- Service Member Education
- Transition Assistance
- Nutritional Financial Assistance
- Dependent Space-Available Travel
- Report on Military Connected Dependents

In some instances, the Department of Defense is already taking actions to implement these recommendations, and I will direct the Department to develop plans to complete this implementation. In those areas where legislation is required, I expect the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the Congress on my behalf the relevant legislative proposals, which I recommend be enacted without delay.

With respect to the remaining recommendations, given their complexity and our solemn responsibility to ensure that any changes further the objectives above, we will continue working with the Commission to understand how the following proposals would affect the All-Volunteer Force:

- Blended Retirement System
- Reserve Component Duty Statuses
- Exceptional Family Member's Support
- Commissary and Exchange Consolidation

I believe there is merit in all of these recommendations and that they deserve careful consideration and study. I will ensure that the Congress is kept apprised of this ongoing work.

Finally, I agree with the Commission that we need to continue to improve the military health care system. The health care reforms proposed in my Fiscal Year 2016 Budget are a good first step and offer service members, retirees, and their families more control and choice over their health care decisions. This remains a critical issue, and my Administration will work with the

Commission and interested Members of Congress in the coming months to develop additional reform proposals for consideration as part of my Fiscal Year 2017 Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 2015.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the "Sister Ann Keefe Post Office".

At 4:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds, the rotunda of the Capitol, and Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for official Congressional events surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the "Sister Ann Keefe Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1498. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Kenneth E. Floyd, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1499. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Energy Process to Consider LNG Export Applications"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1500. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0519); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1501. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of de-

fense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0517); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1502. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-142); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1503. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Phenol, 2-(2H-benzotriazol-2-yl)-6-dodecyl-4-methyl-; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9925-78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1504. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9926-24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1505. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Permits and Permits by Rule for the Federal Minor New Source Review Program in Indian Country for Five Source Categories" (RIN2060-AQ95) (FRL No. 9919-85-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1506. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designate Facilities and Pollutants; Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Mexico, and the City of Albuquerque, New Mexico; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incinerator Units" (FRL No. 9927-00-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1507. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Stage I Regulations" (FRL No. 99247-10-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1508. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Arkansas; Revisions to the State Implementation Plan; Fee Regulations" (FRL No. 9926-91-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1509. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)" (FRL No. 9926-81-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-19. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota urging the United States Congress to call for a constitutional convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires a balanced federal budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3015

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States mandates that upon the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the states, Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments; and

Whereas, this application is to be considered as covering the balanced budget amendment language of the presently outstanding balanced budget applications from other states; and

Whereas, this application shall be aggregated for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds necessary to require the calling of a convention for proposing a balanced budget amendment, but shall not be aggregated with any applications on any other subject; and

Whereas, this application is a continuing application until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the states have made applications on the same subject; and

Whereas, the North Dakota Legislative Assembly deems an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring a balanced federal budget to be necessary for the good of the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate Concurring therein:

That the Sixty-fourth Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states limited to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that in the absence of a national emergency the total of all federal appropriations made by the Congress for any fiscal year may not exceed the total of all estimated federal revenues for that fiscal year, together with any related and appropriate fiscal restraints; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the Senate and the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to each member of the United States Congressional Delegation, and also to transmit copies to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the United States, requesting their cooperation.

POM-20. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho urging the United States Congress to expedite appropriation of funds to significantly enhance dreissenid monitoring and prevention efforts and to implement the intent of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 101

Whereas, maintaining a healthy suite of economic, environmental and social ecosystem services in aquatic systems is integral to the quality of life in the State of Idaho; and

Whereas, healthy aquatic habitats provide clean drinking water, flood control, transportation, recreation, purification of human and industrial wastes, power generation,

habitat for native plants and animals, production of their foods, marketable goods, and cultural benefits; and

Whereas, aquatic invasive species, including mussels such as dreissenids, cause irreparable ecological damage to many waters in the United States; and

Whereas, dreissenids have not yet been detected in the Pacific North-West. The estimated cost to address established populations of dreissenids in the Pacific North-West Economic Region is almost \$500 million annually; and

Whereas, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act was signed in June 2014 and authorizes \$20 million for Columbia River Basin dreissenid efforts through the Secretary of the Army: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the member of the First Regular Session of the Sixty-third Idaho Legislature, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring therein, that we respectfully request Congress expedite appropriation of these funds to significantly enhance monitoring and prevention efforts and to implement the intent of the Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and she is hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United States Barack Obama, the United States Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the congressional delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

POM-21. A resolution approved by the Electors of the City of Watertown, Wisconsin, calling for reclaiming the expansion of the rights of artificial legal entities and the corrupting influence of unregulated political spending; and supporting an amendment to the United States Constitution, stating: only human beings—not corporations, unions, nonprofits, or similar associations—are endowed with constitutional rights, and that money is not speech, and therefore regulating political contributions and spending is not equivalent to limiting political speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 993. A bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 1177. An original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Peter Levine, of Maryland, to be Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

Army nomination of Col. Raymond S. Dingle, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Ron. J. MacLaren, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Herman A. Shelanski, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Joseph Anderson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. James J. Burks, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. James C. Balserak and ending with Brig. Gen. Carol A. Timmons, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Air Force nomination of Col. Kyle W. Robinson, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Robert D. Carlson and ending with Col. Tracy L. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Army nomination of Chaplain (Col.) Thomas L. Solhjelm, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Capt. Danelle M. Barrett, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Ronald C. Copley, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. David L. Goldfein, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Timothy M. Ray, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Darryl L. Roberson, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Eric C. Bush, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Alan R. Lynn, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Jill K. Faris, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Gary H. Cheek, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Christian A. Rofrano, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Nora W. Tyson, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Mark A. Brilakis, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert S. Walsh, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Troy S. Thomas, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Linell A. Letendre, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Bamidele A. Adetunji and ending with Keri L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Travis M. Allen and ending with Jeromy James Wells, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Richard S. Beyea III and ending with Travis C. Yelton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Keith L. Clark and ending with Jennie Leigh L. Stoddart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Talib Y. Ali and ending with Gabriel

Zimmerer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nomination of John W. Heck, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Anna Hamm, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Jermal M. Scarbrough, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Cynthia A. Rutherford and ending with Angela Scevola-Dattoli, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Air Force nomination of Susan I. Pangelinan, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Bryan K. Anderson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Mark A. Endsley, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Arpana Jain and ending with Rama Krishna, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 25, 2015.

Army nomination of James J. Raftery, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of David A. Harper, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Steven R. Ansley, Jr. and ending with Karen S. Hanson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Army nomination of Rita A. Kostecke, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Schawn B. Branch and ending with Frank A. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Marine Corps nomination of Joshua B. Roberts, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Dawn R. Alonso and ending with Vincent J. Yasaki, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Nawaz K. A. Hack and ending with Robert P. Rutter, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 25, 2015.

Navy nomination of Brian L. Tichenor, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Cheryl Gotzinger, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of John P. O'Brien, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Carolyn A. Winningham and ending with Sara M. Bustamante, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Mark Scarano, of New Hampshire, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1139. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1140. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 1142. A bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not in interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1143. A bill to make the authority of States of Washington, Oregon, and California to manage Dungeness crab fishery permanent and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1144. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for a corporate responsibility investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1145. A bill to improve compliance with mine safety and health laws, empower miners to raise safety concerns, prevent future mine tragedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1146. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit further reductions in sodium levels and to reinstate the grain-rich requirements applicable to the national school lunch and breakfast programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1147. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1148. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1149. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require reporting of

certain data by providers and suppliers of air ambulance services for purposes of reforming reimbursements for such services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REED, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1150. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1151. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 1152. A bill to make permanent the extended period of protections for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1153. A bill to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1154. A bill to reverse the designation by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture of certain communities in the State of Alaska as nonrural; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1155. A bill to promote the mapping and development of United States geothermal resources by establishing a direct loan program for high risk geothermal exploration wells, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to improve geothermal energy technology and demonstrate the use of geothermal energy in large scale thermal applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1156. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1157. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to consider Brunswick County, North Carolina to be part of the same metropolitan statistical area as Wilmington, North Carolina; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1158. A bill to ensure the privacy and security of sensitive personal information, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to provide notice of security breaches involving sensitive personal information, and to enhance law enforcement assistance and other

protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for charitable purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1160. A bill to amend the Public Land Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service opportunities for young Americans; help restore the nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational and scenic resources; train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts; and promote the value of public service; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1161. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to provide increased protection for horses participating in shows, exhibitions, or sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 1162. A bill to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1163. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1164. A bill to protect consumer from discriminatory State taxes on motor vehicle rentals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1165. A bill to provide consumer protections for students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1166. A bill to establish a pilot grant program to support career and technical education exploration programs in middle schools and high schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1167. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Pole Creek Wilderness, the Owyhee River Wilderness, and the North Fork Owyhee Wilderness and to authorize the continued use of motorized vehicles for livestock monitoring, herding, and grazing in certain wilderness areas in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1168. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rehabilitation innovation centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1169. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1170. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1171. A bill to establish a moratorium on oil and gas-related seismic activities off the coastline of the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1172. A bill to improve the process of presidential transition; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1173. A bill to amend chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the rental of motor vehicles that contain a defect related to motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1174. A bill to deregulate interstate commerce with respect to parimutuel wagering on horseracing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1175. A bill to improve the safety of hazardous materials rail transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 1177. An original bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves; from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1178. A bill to prohibit implementation of a proposed rule relating to the definition of the term "waters of the United States" under the Clean Water Act, or any substantially similar rule, until a Supplemental Scientific Review Panel and Ephemeral and Intermittent Streams Advisory Committee produce certain reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 156. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to childhood stroke and recognizing May 2015 as "National Pediatric Stroke Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. Res. 157. A resolution recognizing the economic, cultural, and political contribu-

tions of the Southeast-Asian American community on the 40th anniversaries of the beginning of Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide and the end of the Vietnam War and the "Secret War" in the Kingdom of Laos; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 158. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historic significance of the Cinco de Mayo holiday; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 159. A resolution designating April 2015, as "National 9-1-1 Education Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COONS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 160. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 161. A resolution designating April 2015 as "Financial Literacy Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. HELLER):

S. Res. 162. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Alcohol Responsibility Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. Res. 163. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the humanitarian catastrophe caused by the April 25, 2015, earthquake in Nepal; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 164. A resolution designating April 30, 2015, as Dia de los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 165. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. Con. Res. 14. A concurrent resolution providing that the President may not provide sanctions relief to Iran until certain United States citizens are released from Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 282

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 282, a bill to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HETTKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 327

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 327, a bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HETTKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 469, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 492

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 492, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 507

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to permit employers to pay higher wages to their employees.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 517

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 517, a bill to extend the secure rural schools and community self-determination program, to restore mandatory funding status to the payment in lieu of taxes program, and for other purposes.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 608

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 608, a bill to prevent homeowners from being forced to pay taxes on forgiven mortgage loan debt.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 622, a bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 727, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property.

S. 753

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 776

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HETTKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 776, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 884

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 884, a bill to improve access to emergency medical services, and for other purposes.

S. 898

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 898, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 939

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 939, a bill to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs within the Department of Energy.

S. 976

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry and to increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space.

S. 981

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 981, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a repatriation holiday, to increase funding to

the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1032, a bill to expand the use of E-Verify, to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for voter registration through the Internet, and for other purposes.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Government agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1117

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1117, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to remove senior executives of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct to include removal of certain other employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill relating to the modernization of C-130 aircraft to meet applicable regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1147

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1147 proposed to H.R. 1191, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1140. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week, I spoke on the floor about a new report by the Bipartisan Policy Center. This report talked about the great progress we have made so far in this Congress, as far as getting things done in a bipartisan way. I believe that is good news. Republicans in the Senate are committed to continuing our progress and to holding more votes on areas of bipartisan agreement. So I want to speak about something Senators on both sides of the aisle agree we can do to protect America's navigable waters.

Our rivers, lakes and other waterways are among America's most treasured resources. In my home State of Wyoming, we have some of the most beautiful rivers in the world: the Snake River, the Wind River, dozens of others.

The people of Wyoming are devoted to keeping these waterways safe and pristine for our children and our grandchildren. They understand there is a right way and a wrong way to do that. It is possible to have reasonable regulations to help preserve our waterways, while at the same time allowing it to be used as natural resources.

We have done it for years under the Clean Water Act. That is the right way

to do it. The wrong way to do it is for Washington bureaucrats—bureaucrats—unelectable, unaccountable, to write harsh and inflexible rules that could block any use of water or even use of land in much of the country. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers have proposed a new rule, a new rule that would expand the Clean Water Act in what I believe is a dangerous new direction.

The rule is an attempt to change the definition of what the law calls waters of the United States. Under the rule, this term could include ditches, it would include dry areas where water only flows for a short time after it rains. Federal regulations have never before listed ditches and other man-made features as waters of the United States.

What the administration is proposing now simply makes no sense. Under this new rule, the new rule they are proposing, isolated ponds could be regulated as waters of the United States. This is the kind of pond that might form in a low-lying piece of land with no connection to a river or a stream. It could be in someone's back yard.

An isolated pond is not navigable water. That is not what the law was designed to protect. This is bipartisan, and there is bipartisan agreement that Washington bureaucrats have no business, none at all, regulating an isolated pond as a water of the United States. Under this newly proposed rule, agriculture water management systems could be regulated as waters of the United States.

We are talking about irrigation ditches. An irrigation ditch is not navigable water. These are manmade ditches that people dig to move water from one place to another to grow crops. This kind of agriculture water is not what the law was designed to protect. There is bipartisan agreement that Washington bureaucrats have no business regulating an irrigation ditch as waters of the United States.

Under this outrageously broad new rule, Washington bureaucrats would now have a say in how farmers and ranchers and families use their own property. It would allow the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate private property just based on things such as whether it is used by animals or birds or even insects. It could regulate any water that moves over land or infiltrates into the ground.

Well, this is an ominously far-reaching definition. It is the wrong way—the wrong way—to protect America's precious water resources. This rule is not designed to protect the traditional waters of the United States, it is designed to expand the power of Washington bureaucrats.

Now, there is a better way to protect America's water, and there is bipartisan support for it in this body. Today, I have introduced the Federal Water Quality Protection Act, along with Senators DONNELLY, INHOFE, HEITKAMP, ROBERTS, MANCHIN, SULLIVAN, ROUNDS,

BLUNT, MCCONNELL, CAPITO, and FISCHER. That is bipartisan. It is a bipartisan agreement that says we need a different approach.

This bill says yes to clean water and no to extreme bureaucracy. It will give the Environmental Protection Agency the direction it needs, the direction to write a strong and reasonable rule that truly protects America's waterways, one that keeps Washington's hands off things such as irrigation ditches, isolated ponds, and groundwater, one that does not allow the determination to be based on plants and insects, one that protects streams that could carry dangerous pollutants to navigable waters or wetlands that protect those waters from pollutants.

It would make sure Washington bureaucrats comply, comply with other laws and Executive orders that, well, they have been avoiding. They would have to do an economic analysis and conduct reviews to protect small businesses, to protect ranchers, to protect farmers. They would have to consult with the States. They have to make sure, by consulting with the States, that we have the approach that works best everywhere, not just the approach Washington likes best.

The Environmental Protection Agency says our concerns are overblown. The administration says there is a lot of misunderstanding about what their regulation covers. It says the Agency has no intention of regulating things like I have just described. The key word there is "intention." This bill would help to make sure the rules are crystal clear.

It gives certainty and clarity to farmers, to ranchers, and to small business owners and their families. People would be able to use their property without fear of Washington bureaucrats knocking on their door. We would also be able to enjoy the beautiful rivers and the lakes that should be preserved and protected. This bipartisan bill does nothing to block legitimate protection of the true waters of the United States. It simply restores Washington's attention to the traditional waters that were always the focus before.

That is what this law should protect. This bill is one easy thing we can do to protect Americans from runaway bureaucracy. The Senate has been very productive so far this year. We are going to keep going. We are going to go with more ideas that have bipartisan support. The Federal Water Quality Protection Act is one of them. I want to thank some of the many cosponsors.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small businesses; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act of 2015. I am very pleased to be joined by my friend

and colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY, in introducing this bipartisan bill.

I know it will come as no surprise to the Presiding Officer that small businesses are our Nation's job creators. Firms with fewer than 500 employees generate about 50 percent of our Nation's GDP, account for more than 99 percent of employers, and employ nearly half of all workers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, small businesses generated 63 percent of the net new jobs that were created between 1993 and 2013.

Even the smallest firms have a notable effect on our economy. The Small Business Administration's data indicates that businesses with fewer than 20 employees accounted for 18 percent of all private sector jobs in 2013. Our bill allows small businesses to plan for capital investments that are vital to expansion and job creation. It eases complex accounting rules for the smallest businesses and it reduces the tax burden on newly formed ventures.

Recent studies by the National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, indicate that taxes are the No. 1 concern of small business owners and that constant change in the Tax Code is among their chief concerns, and that is certainly the case in the State of Maine. When I talk with employers across the State, they constantly tell me the uncertainty in our Tax Code and in the regulations that are coming out of Washington make it very difficult for them to plan, to hire new workers, and to know what is going to be coming their way.

A key feature of our bill is that it provides the certainty that small businesses need to create and implement long-term capital investment plans that are vital to their growth. I will give an example. Section 179 of the Internal Revenue Code allows small businesses to deduct the costs of acquired assets more rapidly. The amount of the maximum allowable deduction has changed three times in the past 8 years. Making matters worse, it is usually not addressed until it is part of a huge package of extenders passed at the end of the year, making this tax benefit unpredictable from year to year and, therefore, difficult for small businesses to take full advantage of in their long-range planning. They essentially have to gamble that the tax incentive is going to be extended and that it is going to be made retroactive to the 1st of the year.

Just recently, I spoke with Patrick Schrader from Arundel Machine, a small business in Maine. He told me that the uncertainty surrounding section 179 has hindered his ability to make sound business decisions. The high-tech equipment that he needs requires months of lead time. For a small business like Patrick's, it is very risky to increase spending to expand and create new jobs when the deductibility of the machinery that helps to make those jobs possible remains unknown

until late December. For business planning, this is information that is vital to have at the beginning of the year, not at the end of the year. This uncertainty has a direct impact on hiring decisions and the ability to take advantage of business opportunities.

Our bill permanently sets the maximum allowable deduction under section 179 at \$500,000, indexed for inflation, and it is also structured in such a way that it is really targeted to our smaller businesses.

Our bill will also permanently extend the ability of restaurants, retailers, and certain businesses that lease their space to depreciate the costs of property improvements over 15 years rather than over 39 years. Think about that. What restaurant is going to be able to wait 39 years before doing upgrades and improvements? What we are trying to do is to better match the depreciation schedule with the need to update a restaurant or a retail space.

The Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act also allows more companies to use the cash method of accounting by permanently doubling the threshold at which the more complex accrual method is required from \$5 million in gross receipts to \$10 million. This includes an expansion in the ability of small businesses to use simplified methods of accounting for inventories.

Our legislation also eases the tax burden on a new startup business by permanently doubling the deduction for those initial expenses from \$5,000 to \$10,000, and for a very small business, that is really important. Similar to section 179, this benefit is limited to small businesses and the deduction phases out for total expenses exceeding \$60,000.

Our legislation extends for 1 year a provision that provides benefits to businesses of all sizes, the so-called bonus depreciation.

Let me make clear that I continue to believe Congress should undertake comprehensive tax reform, with three major goals. It should result in a Tax Code that is more pro-growth, that is fairer, and that is simpler. I urge the Senate to undertake such a reform, but in the meantime, the provisions of our bill would make a real difference in the ability of our Nation's small businesses to keep and create jobs.

I will give another real-life example of what the small business expensing provisions can mean. I am proud to say Maine is known for its delicious craft beers. Dan Kleban founded Maine Beer Company with his brother in 2009. In 6 short years, the company has added 21 good-paying jobs with generous health and retirement benefits. They plan to hire at least three more workers shortly. Dan noted that his company's business decisions were directly affected by section 179 expensing.

Here is why. This provision allowed them to expand by reinvesting their capital in new equipment to produce more beer and hire more Mainers.

Those are both good outcomes. In the last 3 years, they have taken the maximum deduction allowed under section 179 to acquire the equipment they needed to expand their business. This year, they hope to use the provision to finance the cost of a solar project that will offset nearly 50 percent of their energy consumption.

If their business had been forced to spread these deductions over many years, its owners would not have been able to grow the business as they have done nor create those good jobs. This economic benefit is multiplied when we consider the effect of the investment by Maine Beer Company and Maine's many other craft brewers on the equipment manufacturers, the transportation companies needed to haul the new equipment to their breweries, the increased inventory in their breweries, and the suppliers of the materials needed to brew the additional beer. So it has a ripple effect that benefits many other businesses and allows them to create more jobs as well.

In February, NFIB released new research that backs up this claim with hard numbers. They found that simply extending section 179 permanently at the 2014 level could increase employment by as much as 197,000 jobs during the 10-year window following implementation. U.S. real output could also increase by as much as \$18.6 billion over the same period.

In light of the positive effects this bill would have on small businesses, on job creation, and on our economy, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act. I would note that the bill has been endorsed by NFIB, the leading voice for small business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of endorsement from the NFIB be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: on behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I write in support of your Small Business Tax Certainty and Growth Act, which would provide certainty and permanency with regard to several important tax provisions for small businesses.

The most important source of financing for small business is their earnings, i.e. cash flow. In fact, cash flow is ranked 13th out of 75 potential business problems in NFIB's Small Business and Priorities. This is why NFIB is particularly pleased to see the inclusion of reformed Section 179 expensing and expanded eligibility for cash accounting in your legislation.

Expensing provides small businesses with an immediate source of capital recovery and improved cash flow. Unfortunately, small business expensing levels have only been increased on a temporary basis, and at the beginning of this year the limit reverted back to \$25,000, which is highly inadequate for the

needs of small businesses. Unless Congress acts, this lower expensing limit will mean that only 30 percent of NFIB members will receive the full benefit of small business expensing in 2015. A 2015 NFIB Research Foundation study shows that a permanent expansion of the expensing deduction allowance limit to \$500,000 could increase employment by as much as 197,000 jobs. NFIB supports permanently increasing expensing limits to \$500,000 as well as permitting taxpayers to expense the cost of some improvements to real property. We appreciate you accomplishing these goals in your legislation while also permanently indexing this provision to inflation.

Furthermore, small businesses would benefit from the greater ability to use cash accounting for tax purposes. This simplified accounting process would alleviate some of the complexity of the tax code, which currently makes it very difficult for small business owners to plan future investments, hire new workers and grow their businesses. Expanded cash accounting would help business owners manage cash flow while better reflecting their ability to pay taxes.

Thank you for introducing this important legislation. We look forward to working with you to provide tax relief for small businesses in the 114th Congress.

Sincerely,

AMANDA AUSTIN,
Vice President, Public Policy.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REED, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1150. A bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont is among only 22 States in the Nation with a minimum wage higher than that of the Federal minimum wage. The Green Mountain State has long recognized the importance of paying workers a fair and livable wage, and it is past time for Congress to catch up with the daily struggles of working American families.

That is why today I am proud to join as a cosponsor of Senator MURRAY's Raise the Wage Act, to increase the Federal minimum wage to \$12 by 2020. The Raise the Wage Act will help more 38 million Americans and thousands of Vermonters who yearn for financial security, for the sound footing to build their lives, and the lives of their children.

The Federal minimum wage has not kept up with inflation. In fact, it has lost more than 30 percent of its value since 1968. Over that same time, productivity has doubled, and low-wage workers today bring more experience and education to the workforce. Amer-

ican workers are being asked to work more for less. It is past time to adjust this disparity.

In Vermont, 64,000 workers would see their wages improve if we raised the minimum wage to \$12. That is roughly \$141 million in added income for families in Vermont—families who could spend these earnings at the store down the street, multiplying the economic impact to resonate through our local economies and downtown businesses.

Today, nearly two-thirds of Americans who earn the minimum wage or less are women; the Raise the Wage Act will improve the hard-earned wages of more than 21 million American women.

No one who works hard in a full-time job should live in poverty in our land, and raising the minimum wage should not be a question; it is commonsense, it is fair, and it is right. It is the right step to take to help ensure that workers can earn wages that support their families.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1153. A bill to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1153

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Red River Private Property Protection Act".

SEC. 2. DISCLAIMER AND OUTDATED SURVEYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary hereby disclaims any right, title, and interest to all land located south of the South Bank boundary line of the Red River in the affected area.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF PRIOR SURVEYS.—Previous surveys conducted by the Bureau of Land Management shall have no force or effect in determining the current South Bank boundary line.

SEC. 3. IDENTIFICATION OF CURRENT BOUNDARY.

(a) BOUNDARY IDENTIFICATION.—To identify the current South Bank boundary line along the affected area, the Secretary shall commission a new survey that—

(1) adheres to the gradient boundary survey method;

(2) spans the entire length of the affected area;

(3) is conducted by Licensed State Land Surveyors chosen by the Texas General Land Office; and

(4) is completed not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPROVAL OF THE SURVEY.—The Secretary shall submit the survey conducted under this Act to the Texas General Land Office for approval. State approval of the completed survey shall satisfy the requirements under this Act.

SEC. 4. APPEAL.

Not later than 1 year after the survey is completed and approved pursuant to section

3, a private property owner who holds right, title, or interest in the affected area may appeal public domain claims by the Secretary to an Administrative Law Judge.

SEC. 5. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

The Secretary shall ensure that no parcels of land in the affected area are treated as Federal land for the purpose of any resource management plan until the survey has been completed and approved and the Secretary ensures that the parcel is not subject to further appeal pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 6. CONSTRUCTION.

This Act does not change or affect in any manner the interest of the States or sovereignty rights of federally recognized Indian tribes over lands located to the north of the South Bank boundary line of the Red River as established by this Act.

SEC. 7. SALE OF REMAINING RED RIVER SURFACE RIGHTS.

(a) **COMPETITIVE SALE OF IDENTIFIED FEDERAL LANDS.**—After the survey has been completed and approved and the Secretary ensures that a parcel is not subject to further appeal under this Act, the Secretary shall offer any and all such remaining identified Federal lands for disposal by competitive sale for not less than fair market value as determined by an appraisal conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(b) **EXISTING RIGHTS.**—The sale of identified Federal lands under this section shall be subject to valid existing tribal, State, and local rights.

(c) **PROCEEDS OF SALE OF LANDS.**—Net proceeds from the sale of identified Federal lands under this section shall be used to offset any costs associated with this Act.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a list of any identified Federal lands that have not been sold under subsection (a) and the reasons such lands were not sold.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(1) **AFFECTED AREA.**—The term “affected area” means lands along the approximately 116-mile stretch of the Red River from its confluence with the North Fork of the Red River on the west to the 98th meridian on the east between the States of Texas and Oklahoma.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of Bureau of Land Management.

(3) **SOUTH BANK.**—The term “South Bank” means the water-washed and relatively permanent elevation or acclivity, commonly called a cut bank, along the southerly or right side of the Red River which separates its bed from the adjacent upland, whether valley or hill, and usually serves to confine the waters within the bed and to preserve the course of the river; as specified in the fifth paragraph of the decree rendered March 12, 1923, in *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U. S. 340, 43 S. Ct. 376, 67 L. Ed. 687.

(4) **SOUTH BANK BOUNDARY LINE.**—The term “South Bank boundary line” means the boundary between Texas and Oklahoma identified through the gradient boundary survey method; as specified in the sixth and seventh paragraphs of the decree rendered March 12, 1923, in *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U. S. 340, 43 S. Ct. 376, 67 L. Ed. 687.

(5) **GRADIENT BOUNDARY SURVEY METHOD.**—The term “gradient boundary survey meth-

od” means the measurement technique used to locate the South Bank boundary line under the methodology established by the United States Supreme Court which recognizes that the boundary line between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along the Red River is subject to such changes as have been or may be wrought by the natural and gradual processes known as erosion and accretion as specified in the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of the decree rendered March 12, 1923, in *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U. S. 340, 43 S. Ct. 376, 67 L. Ed. 687.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1156. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Employees and Retirees in Business Bankruptcies Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

TITLE I—IMPROVING RECOVERIES FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

Sec. 101. Increased wage priority.

Sec. 102. Claim for stock value losses in defined contribution plans.

Sec. 103. Priority for severance pay.

Sec. 104. Financial returns for employees and retirees.

Sec. 105. Priority for WARN Act damages.

TITLE II—REDUCING EMPLOYEES' AND RETIREES' LOSSES

Sec. 201. Rejection of collective bargaining agreements.

Sec. 202. Payment of insurance benefits to retired employees.

Sec. 203. Protection of employee benefits in a sale of assets.

Sec. 204. Claim for pension losses.

Sec. 205. Payments by secured lender.

Sec. 206. Preservation of jobs and benefits.

Sec. 207. Termination of exclusivity.

Sec. 208. Claim for withdrawal liability.

TITLE III—RESTRICTING EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Executive compensation upon exit from bankruptcy.

Sec. 302. Limitations on executive compensation enhancements.

Sec. 303. Assumption of executive benefit plans.

Sec. 304. Recovery of executive compensation.

Sec. 305. Preferential compensation transfer.

TITLE IV—OTHER PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Union proof of claim.

Sec. 402. Exception from automatic stay.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Business bankruptcies have increased sharply in recent years and remain at high levels. These bankruptcies include several of the largest business bankruptcy filings in

history. As the use of bankruptcy has expanded, job preservation and retirement security are placed at greater risk.

(2) Laws enacted to improve recoveries for employees and retirees and limit their losses in bankruptcy cases have not kept pace with the increasing and broader use of bankruptcy by businesses in all sectors of the economy. However, while protections for employees and retirees in bankruptcy cases have eroded, management compensation plans devised for those in charge of troubled businesses have become more prevalent and are escaping adequate scrutiny.

(3) Changes in the law regarding these matters are urgently needed as bankruptcy is used to address increasingly more complex and diverse conditions affecting troubled businesses and industries.

TITLE I—IMPROVING RECOVERIES FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES

SEC. 101. INCREASED WAGE PRIORITY.

Section 507(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “\$10,000” and inserting “\$20,000”;

(B) by striking “within 180 days”; and

(C) by striking “or the date of the cessation of the debtor’s business, whichever occurs first,”;

(2) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking—

(A) “within 180 days”; and

(B) “or the date of the cessation of the debtor’s business, whichever occurs first”; and

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) for each such plan, to the extent of the number of employees covered by each such plan, multiplied by \$20,000.”.

SEC. 102. CLAIM FOR STOCK VALUE LOSSES IN DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLANS.

Section 101(5) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) right or interest in equity securities of the debtor, or an affiliate of the debtor, held in a defined contribution plan (within the meaning of section 3(34) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(34))) for the benefit of an individual who is not an insider, a senior executive officer, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor (if 1 or more are not insiders), if such securities were attributable to either employer contributions by the debtor or an affiliate of the debtor, or elective deferrals (within the meaning of section 402(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), and any earnings thereon, if an employer or plan sponsor who has commenced a case under this title has committed fraud with respect to such plan or has otherwise breached a duty to the participant that has proximately caused the loss of value.”.

SEC. 103. PRIORITY FOR SEVERANCE PAY.

Section 503(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)(B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) severance pay owed to employees of the debtor (other than to an insider, other senior management, or a consultant retained to provide services to the debtor), under a plan, program, or policy generally applicable to employees of the debtor (but not under an individual contract of employment), or owed

pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement, for layoff or termination on or after the date of the filing of the petition, which pay shall be deemed earned in full upon such layoff or termination of employment; and”.

SEC. 104. FINANCIAL RETURNS FOR EMPLOYEES AND RETIREES.

Section 1129(a) of title 11, United States Code is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

“(17) The plan provides for recovery of damages payable for the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement, or for other financial returns as negotiated by the debtor and the authorized representative under section 1113 (to the extent that such returns are paid under, rather than outside of, a plan).”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (13) and inserting the following:

“(13) With respect to retiree benefits, as that term is defined in section 1114(a), the plan—

“(A) provides for the continuation after its effective date of payment of all retiree benefits at the level established pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B) or (g) of section 1114 at any time before the date of confirmation of the plan, for the duration of the period for which the debtor has obligated itself to provide such benefits, or if no modifications are made before confirmation of the plan, the continuation of all such retiree benefits maintained or established in whole or in part by the debtor before the date of the filing of the petition; and

“(B) provides for recovery of claims arising from the modification of retiree benefits or for other financial returns, as negotiated by the debtor and the authorized representative (to the extent that such returns are paid under, rather than outside of, a plan).”.

SEC. 105. PRIORITY FOR WARN ACT DAMAGES.

Section 503(b)(1)(A)(ii) of title 11, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) wages and benefits awarded pursuant to a judicial proceeding or a proceeding of the National Labor Relations Board as back pay or damages attributable to any period of time occurring after the date of commencement of the case under this title, as a result of a violation of Federal or State law by the debtor, without regard to the time of the occurrence of unlawful conduct on which the award is based or to whether any services were rendered on or after the commencement of the case, including an award by a court under section 2901 of title 29, United States Code, of up to 60 days’ pay and benefits following a layoff that occurred or commenced at a time when such award period includes a period on or after the commencement of the case, if the court determines that payment of wages and benefits by reason of the operation of this clause will not substantially increase the probability of layoff or termination of current employees or of nonpayment of domestic support obligations during the case under this title.”.

TITLE II—REDUCING EMPLOYEES’ AND RETIREES’ LOSSES

SEC. 201. REJECTION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.

Section 1113 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (a) through (f) and inserting the following:

“(a) The debtor in possession, or the trustee if one has been appointed under this chapter, other than a trustee in a case covered by subchapter IV of this chapter and by title I of the Railway Labor Act, may reject a collective bargaining agreement only in accordance with this section. In this section, a reference to the trustee includes the debtor in possession.

“(b) No provision of this title shall be construed to permit the trustee to unilaterally

terminate or alter any provision of a collective bargaining agreement before complying with this section. The trustee shall timely pay all monetary obligations arising under the terms of the collective bargaining agreement. Any such payment required to be made before a plan confirmed under section 1129 is effective has the status of an allowed administrative expense under section 503.

“(c)(1) If the trustee seeks modification of a collective bargaining agreement, the trustee shall provide notice to the labor organization representing the employees covered by the agreement that modifications are being proposed under this section, and shall promptly provide an initial proposal for modifications to the agreement. Thereafter, the trustee shall confer in good faith with the labor organization, at reasonable times and for a reasonable period in light of the complexity of the case, in attempting to reach mutually acceptable modifications of such agreement.

“(2) The initial proposal and subsequent proposals by the trustee for modification of a collective bargaining agreement shall be based upon a business plan for the reorganization of the debtor, and shall reflect the most complete and reliable information available. The trustee shall provide to the labor organization all information that is relevant for negotiations. The court may enter a protective order to prevent the disclosure of information if disclosure could compromise the debtor’s position with respect to its competitors in the industry, subject to the needs of the labor organization to evaluate the trustee’s proposals and any application for rejection of the agreement or for interim relief pursuant to this section.

“(3) In consideration of Federal policy encouraging the practice and process of collective bargaining and in recognition of the bargained-for expectations of the employees covered by the agreement, modifications proposed by the trustee—

“(A) shall be proposed only as part of a program of workforce and nonworkforce cost savings devised for the reorganization of the debtor, including savings in management personnel costs;

“(B) shall be limited to modifications designed to achieve a specified aggregate financial contribution for the employees covered by the agreement (taking into consideration any labor cost savings negotiated within the 12-month period before the filing of the petition), and shall be not more than the minimum savings essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by the liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term; and

“(C) shall not be disproportionate or overly burden the employees covered by the agreement, either in the amount of the cost savings sought from such employees or the nature of the modifications.

“(d)(1) If, after a period of negotiations, the trustee and the labor organization have not reached an agreement over mutually satisfactory modifications, and further negotiations are not likely to produce mutually satisfactory modifications, the trustee may file a motion seeking rejection of the collective bargaining agreement after notice and a hearing. Absent agreement of the parties, no such hearing shall be held before the expiration of the 21-day period beginning on the date on which notice of the hearing is provided to the labor organization representing the employees covered by the agreement. Only the debtor and the labor organization may appear and be heard at such hearing. An application for rejection shall seek rejection effective upon the entry of an order granting the relief.

“(2) In consideration of Federal policy encouraging the practice and process of collective bargaining and in recognition of the bargained-for expectations of the employees covered by the agreement, the court may grant a motion seeking rejection of a collective bargaining agreement only if, based on clear and convincing evidence—

“(A) the court finds that the trustee has complied with the requirements of subsection (c);

“(B) the court has considered alternative proposals by the labor organization and has concluded that such proposals do not meet the requirements of paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (c);

“(C) the court finds that further negotiations regarding the trustee’s proposal or an alternative proposal by the labor organization are not likely to produce an agreement;

“(D) the court finds that implementation of the trustee’s proposal shall not—

“(i) cause a material diminution in the purchasing power of the employees covered by the agreement;

“(ii) adversely affect the ability of the debtor to retain an experienced and qualified workforce; or

“(iii) impair the debtor’s labor relations such that the ability to achieve a feasible reorganization would be compromised; and

“(E) the court concludes that rejection of the agreement and immediate implementation of the trustee’s proposal is essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term.

“(3) If the trustee has implemented a program of incentive pay, bonuses, or other financial returns for insiders, senior executive officers, or the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor during the bankruptcy, or such a program was implemented within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition, the court shall presume that the trustee has failed to satisfy the requirements of subsection (c)(3)(C).

“(4) In no case shall the court enter an order rejecting a collective bargaining agreement that would result in modifications to a level lower than the level proposed by the trustee in the proposal found by the court to have complied with the requirements of this section.

“(5) At any time after the date on which an order rejecting a collective bargaining agreement is entered, or in the case of an agreement entered into between the trustee and the labor organization providing mutually satisfactory modifications, at any time after such agreement has been entered into, the labor organization may apply to the court for an order seeking an increase in the level of wages or benefits, or relief from working conditions, based upon changed circumstances. The court shall grant the request only if the increase or other relief is not inconsistent with the standard set forth in paragraph (2)(E).

“(e) During a period in which a collective bargaining agreement at issue under this section continues in effect, and if essential to the continuation of the debtor’s business or in order to avoid irreparable damage to the estate, the court, after notice and a hearing, may authorize the trustee to implement interim changes in the terms, conditions, wages, benefits, or work rules provided by the collective bargaining agreement. Any hearing under this subsection shall be scheduled in accordance with the needs of the trustee. The implementation of such interim changes shall not render the application for rejection moot.

“(f)(1) Rejection of a collective bargaining agreement constitutes a breach of the agreement, and shall be effective no earlier than the entry of an order granting such relief.

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), solely for purposes of determining and allowing a claim arising from the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement, rejection shall be treated as rejection of an executory contract under section 365(g) and shall be allowed or disallowed in accordance with section 502(g)(1). No claim for rejection damages shall be limited by section 502(b)(7). Economic self-help by a labor organization shall be permitted upon a court order granting a motion to reject a collective bargaining agreement under subsection (d) or pursuant to subsection (e), and no provision of this title or of any other provision of Federal or State law may be construed to the contrary.

“(g) The trustee shall provide for the reasonable fees and costs incurred by a labor organization under this section, upon request and after notice and a hearing.

“(h) A collective bargaining agreement that is assumed shall be assumed in accordance with section 365.”.

SEC. 202. PAYMENT OF INSURANCE BENEFITS TO RETIRED EMPLOYEES.

Section 1114 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “, without regard to whether the debtor asserts a right to unilaterally modify such payments under such plan, fund, or program” before the period at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting after “section” the following: “, and a labor organization serving as the authorized representative under subsection (c)(1).”;

(3) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f)(1) If a trustee seeks modification of retiree benefits, the trustee shall provide a notice to the authorized representative that modifications are being proposed pursuant to this section, and shall promptly provide an initial proposal. Thereafter, the trustee shall confer in good faith with the authorized representative at reasonable times and for a reasonable period in light of the complexity of the case in attempting to reach mutually satisfactory modifications.

“(2) The initial proposal and subsequent proposals by the trustee shall be based upon a business plan for the reorganization of the debtor and shall reflect the most complete and reliable information available. The trustee shall provide to the authorized representative all information that is relevant for the negotiations. The court may enter a protective order to prevent the disclosure of information if disclosure could compromise the debtor's position with respect to its competitors in the industry, subject to the needs of the authorized representative to evaluate the trustee's proposals and an application pursuant to subsection (g) or (h).

“(3) Modifications proposed by the trustee—

“(A) shall be proposed only as part of a program of workforce and nonworkforce cost savings devised for the reorganization of the debtor, including savings in management personnel costs;

“(B) shall be limited to modifications that are designed to achieve a specified aggregate financial contribution for the retiree group represented by the authorized representative (taking into consideration any cost savings implemented within the 12-month period before the date of filing of the petition with respect to the retiree group), and shall be no more than the minimum savings essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by the liquidation, or the need for further financial reorga-

nization, of the debtor (or any successor to the debtor) in the short term; and

“(C) shall not be disproportionate or overly burden the retiree group, either in the amount of the cost savings sought from such group or the nature of the modifications.”;

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “(g)” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(g)(1) If, after a period of negotiations, the trustee and the authorized representative have not reached agreement over mutually satisfactory modifications and further negotiations are not likely to produce mutually satisfactory modifications, the trustee may file a motion seeking modifications in the payment of retiree benefits after notice and a hearing. Absent agreement of the parties, no such hearing shall be held before the expiration of the 21-day period beginning on the date on which notice of the hearing is provided to the authorized representative. Only the debtor and the authorized representative may appear and be heard at such hearing.

“(2) The court may grant a motion to modify the payment of retiree benefits only if, based on clear and convincing evidence—

“(A) the court finds that the trustee has complied with the requirements of subsection (f);

“(B) the court has considered alternative proposals by the authorized representative and has determined that such proposals do not meet the requirements of subsection (f)(3)(B);

“(C) the court finds that further negotiations regarding the trustee's proposal or an alternative proposal by the authorized representative are not likely to produce a mutually satisfactory agreement;

“(D) the court finds that implementation of the proposal shall not cause irreparable harm to the affected retirees; and

“(E) the court concludes that an order granting the motion and immediate implementation of the trustee's proposal is essential to permit the debtor to exit bankruptcy, such that confirmation of a plan of reorganization is not likely to be followed by liquidation, or the need for further financial reorganization, of the debtor (or a successor to the debtor) in the short term.

“(3) If a trustee has implemented a program of incentive pay, bonuses, or other financial returns for insiders, senior executive officers, or the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor during the bankruptcy, or such a program was implemented within 180 days before the date of the filing of the petition, the court shall presume that the trustee has failed to satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (f)(3)(C).”;

(B) by striking “except that in no case” and inserting the following:

“(4) In no case”; and

(5) by striking subsection (k) and redesignating subsections (l) and (m) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively.

SEC. 203. PROTECTION OF EMPLOYEE BENEFITS IN A SALE OF ASSETS.

Section 363(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In approving a sale under this subsection, the court shall consider the extent to which a bidder has offered to maintain existing jobs, preserve terms and conditions of employment, and assume or match pension and retiree health benefit obligations in determining whether an offer constitutes the highest or best offer for such property.”.

SEC. 204. CLAIM FOR PENSION LOSSES.

Section 502 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) The court shall allow a claim asserted by an active or retired participant, or by a labor organization representing such participants, in a defined benefit plan terminated under section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, for any shortfall in pension benefits accrued as of the effective date of the termination of such pension plan as a result of the termination of the plan and limitations upon the payment of benefits imposed pursuant to section 4022 of such Act, notwithstanding any claim asserted and collected by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation with respect to such termination.

“(m) The court shall allow a claim of a kind described in section 101(5)(C) by an active or retired participant in a defined contribution plan (within the meaning of section 3(34) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(34))), or by a labor organization representing such participants. The amount of such claim shall be measured by the market value of the stock at the time of contribution to, or purchase by, the plan and the value as of the commencement of the case.”.

SEC. 205. PAYMENTS BY SECURED LENDER.

Section 506(c) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “If employees have not received wages, accrued vacation, severance, or other benefits owed under the policies and practices of the debtor, or pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement, for services rendered on and after the date of the commencement of the case, such unpaid obligations shall be deemed necessary costs and expenses of preserving, or disposing of, property securing an allowed secured claim and shall be recovered even if the trustee has otherwise waived the provisions of this subsection under an agreement with the holder of the allowed secured claim or a successor or predecessor in interest.”.

SEC. 206. PRESERVATION OF JOBS AND BENEFITS.

Chapter 11 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting before section 1101 the following:

“§ 1100. Statement of purpose

“A debtor commencing a case under this chapter shall have as its principal purpose the reorganization of its business to preserve going concern value to the maximum extent possible through the productive use of its assets and the preservation of jobs that will sustain productive economic activity.”;

(2) in section 1129(a), as amended by section 104, by adding at the end the following:

“(18) The debtor has demonstrated that the reorganization preserves going concern value to the maximum extent possible through the productive use of the debtor's assets and preserves jobs that sustain productive economic activity.”;

(3) in section 1129(c)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” after “(c)”; and

(B) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following:

“(2) If the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) are met with respect to more than 1 plan, the court shall, in determining which plan to confirm—

“(A) consider the extent to which each plan would preserve going concern value through the productive use of the debtor's assets and the preservation of jobs that sustain productive economic activity; and

“(B) confirm the plan that better serves such interests.

“(3) A plan that incorporates the terms of a settlement with a labor organization representing employees of the debtor shall presumptively constitute the plan that satisfies this subsection.”; and

(4) in the table of sections, by inserting before the item relating to section 1101 the following:

“1100. Statement of purpose.”.

SEC. 207. TERMINATION OF EXCLUSIVITY.

Section 1121(d) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) For purposes of this subsection, cause for reducing the 120-day period or the 180-day period includes the following:

“(A) The filing of a motion pursuant to section 1113 seeking rejection of a collective bargaining agreement if a plan based upon an alternative proposal by the labor organization is reasonably likely to be confirmed within a reasonable time.

“(B) The proposed filing of a plan by a proponent other than the debtor, which incorporates the terms of a settlement with a labor organization if such plan is reasonably likely to be confirmed within a reasonable time.”.

SEC. 208. CLAIM FOR WITHDRAWAL LIABILITY.

Section 503(b) of title 11, United States Code, as amended by section 103 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) with respect to withdrawal liability owed to a multiemployer pension plan for a complete or partial withdrawal pursuant to section 4201 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1381) where such withdrawal occurs on or after the commencement of the case, an amount equal to the amount of vested benefits payable from such pension plan that accrued as a result of employees' services rendered to the debtor during the period beginning on the date of commencement of the case and ending on the date of the withdrawal from the plan.”.

TITLE III—RESTRICTING EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION UPON EXIT FROM BANKRUPTCY.

Section 1129(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: “Except for compensation subject to review under paragraph (5), payments or other distributions under the plan to or for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, and any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees or consultants providing services to the debtor, shall not be approved except as part of a program of payments or distributions generally applicable to employees of the debtor, and only to the extent that the court determines that such payments are not excessive or disproportionate compared to distributions to the debtor's nonmanagement workforce.”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the compensation disclosed pursuant to subparagraph (B) has been approved by, or is subject to the approval of, the court as reasonable when compared to individuals holding comparable positions at comparable companies in the same industry and not disproportionate in light of economic concessions by the debtor's nonmanagement workforce during the case.”.

SEC. 302. LIMITATIONS ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION ENHANCEMENTS.

Section 503(c) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting “, a senior executive officer, or any of the 20 next most highly com-

pensated employees or consultants” after “an insider”;

(B) by inserting “or for the payment of performance or incentive compensation, or a bonus of any kind, or other financial returns designed to replace or enhance incentive, stock, or other compensation in effect before the date of the commencement of the case,” after “remain with the debtor's business,”; and

(C) by inserting “clear and convincing” before “evidence in the record”; and

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) other transfers or obligations, to or for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, managers, or consultants providing services to the debtor, in the absence of a finding by the court, based upon clear and convincing evidence, and without deference to the debtor's request for such payments, that such transfers or obligations are essential to the survival of the debtor's business or (in the case of a liquidation of some or all of the debtor's assets) essential to the orderly liquidation and maximization of value of the assets of the debtor, in either case, because of the essential nature of the services provided, and then only to the extent that the court finds such transfers or obligations are reasonable compared to individuals holding comparable positions at comparable companies in the same industry and not disproportionate in light of economic concessions by the debtor's nonmanagement workforce during the case.”.

SEC. 303. ASSUMPTION OF EXECUTIVE BENEFIT PLANS.

Section 365 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “and (d)” and inserting “(d), (q), and (r)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(q) No deferred compensation arrangement for the benefit of insiders, senior executive officers, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor shall be assumed if a defined benefit plan for employees of the debtor has been terminated pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, on or after the date of the commencement of the case or within 180 days before the date of the commencement of the case.

“(r) No plan, fund, program, or contract to provide retiree benefits for insiders, senior executive officers, or any of the 20 next most highly compensated employees of the debtor shall be assumed if the debtor has obtained relief under subsection (g) or (h) of section 1114 to impose reductions in retiree benefits or under subsection (d) or (e) of section 1113 to impose reductions in the health benefits of active employees of the debtor, or reduced or eliminated health benefits for active or retired employees within 180 days before the date of the commencement of the case.”.

SEC. 304. RECOVERY OF EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 562 the following:

“§ 563. Recovery of executive compensation

“(a) If a debtor has obtained relief under subsection (d) of section 1113, or subsection (g) of section 1114, by which the debtor reduces the cost of its obligations under a collective bargaining agreement or a plan, fund, or program for retiree benefits as defined in section 1114(a), the court, in granting relief, shall determine the percentage diminution in the value of the obligations when compared to the debtor's obligations under the collective bargaining agreement, or with respect to retiree benefits, as of the date of the commencement of the case under this title before granting such relief. In making its de-

termination, the court shall include reductions in benefits, if any, as a result of the termination pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, of a defined benefit plan administered by the debtor, or for which the debtor is a contributing employer, effective at any time on or after 180 days before the date of the commencement of a case under this title. The court shall not take into account pension benefits paid or payable under such Act as a result of any such termination.

“(b) If a defined benefit pension plan administered by the debtor, or for which the debtor is a contributing employer, has been terminated pursuant to section 4041 or 4042 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, effective at any time on or after 180 days before the date of the commencement of a case under this title, but a debtor has not obtained relief under subsection (d) of section 1113, or subsection (g) of section 1114, the court, upon motion of a party in interest, shall determine the percentage diminution in the value of benefit obligations when compared to the total benefit liabilities before such termination. The court shall not take into account pension benefits paid or payable under title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 as a result of any such termination.

“(c) Upon the determination of the percentage diminution in value under subsection (a) or (b), the estate shall have a claim for the return of the same percentage of the compensation paid, directly or indirectly (including any transfer to a self-settled trust or similar device, or to a non-qualified deferred compensation plan under section 409A(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) to any officer of the debtor serving as member of the board of directors of the debtor within the year before the date of the commencement of the case, and any individual serving as chairman or lead director of the board of directors at the time of the granting of relief under section 1113 or 1114 or, if no such relief has been granted, the termination of the defined benefit plan.

“(d) The trustee or a committee appointed pursuant to section 1102 may commence an action to recover such claims, except that if neither the trustee nor such committee commences an action to recover such claim by the first date set for the hearing on the confirmation of plan under section 1129, any party in interest may apply to the court for authority to recover such claim for the benefit of the estate. The costs of recovery shall be borne by the estate.

“(e) The court shall not award postpetition compensation under section 503(c) or otherwise to any person subject to subsection (c) if there is a reasonable likelihood that such compensation is intended to reimburse or replace compensation recovered by the estate under this section.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 5 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 562 the following:

“563. Recovery of executive compensation.”.

SEC. 305. PREFERENTIAL COMPENSATION TRANSFER.

Section 547 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j)(1) The trustee may avoid a transfer—

“(A) made—

“(i) to or for the benefit of an insider (including an obligation incurred for the benefit of an insider under an employment contract) made in anticipation of bankruptcy; or

“(ii) in anticipation of bankruptcy to a consultant who is formerly an insider and

who is retained to provide services to an entity that becomes a debtor (including an obligation under a contract to provide services to such entity or to a debtor); and

“(B) made or incurred on or within 1 year before the filing of the petition.

“(2) No provision of subsection (c) shall constitute a defense against the recovery of a transfer described in paragraph (1).

“(3) The trustee or a committee appointed pursuant to section 1102 may commence an action to recover such transfer, except that, if neither the trustee nor such committee commences an action to recover such transfer by the time of the commencement of a hearing on the confirmation of a plan under section 1129, any party in interest may apply to the court for authority to recover the claims for the benefit of the estate. The costs of recovery shall be borne by the estate.”.

TITLE IV—OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. UNION PROOF OF CLAIM.

Section 501(a) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, including a labor organization,” after “A creditor”.

SEC. 402. EXCEPTION FROM AUTOMATIC STAY.

Section 362(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(29) of the commencement or continuation of a grievance, arbitration, or similar dispute resolution proceeding established by a collective bargaining agreement that was or could have been commenced against the debtor before the filing of a case under this title, or the payment or enforcement of an award or settlement under such proceeding.”.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1158. A bill to ensure the privacy and security of sensitive personal information, to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to provide notice of security breaches involving sensitive personal information, and to enhance law enforcement assistance and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personal information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I am introducing the Consumer Privacy Protection Act of 2015. This comprehensive legislation will help ensure that the corporations Americans entrust with their most personal information are taking steps to keep it secure. Data breaches continue to plague American businesses and compromise the privacy of millions of consumers. At the same time, the amount of information we share with corporations who are the target of these breaches is growing. Corporations collect and store our social security numbers, our bank account information, and our email addresses. They collect information about our private health and medical conditions. They know what routes we take to and from work and where we drop our kids off at school. They can replicate our fingerprints. We even trust them with private photographs that we store in the cloud.

Corporations benefit financially from our personal information, and they should be obligated to take steps to keep it safe. Too often, however, private information falls into the hands of those who would do us harm and we are not even told. Last year, in what is commonly referred to as the “Year of the Data Breach,” breaches at corporations, including Home Depot, Neiman Marcus, and Sony Pictures, as well as many others, demonstrated how vulnerable our corporations are to hackers and cyber criminals. In some cases these breaches exposed credit card data, social security numbers, or bank account information that left millions at risk of financial fraud or identity theft, and in other cases they exposed personal and private information to the public that led to embarrassment and reputational harm.

The Consumer Privacy Protection Act I am introducing today seeks to protect the vast amount of information that we now share with corporations each and every day, and it builds and expands on data security legislation that I have introduced every Congress since 2005. In today’s modern world, data security is no longer just about protecting our identities and our bank accounts; it is about protecting our privacy. Americans want to know when someone has had unauthorized access to their emails, to their bank accounts, and to their private family pictures, but they do not just want to be notified of yet another data breach. Americans want to know that the corporations who are profiting from their information are actually doing something to prevent the next data breach. Consumers should not have to settle for mere notice of data breaches. American consumers deserve protection. This legislation would accomplish that.

The Consumer Privacy Protection Act requires that corporations meet certain privacy and data security standards to keep information they store about their customers safe, and requires that corporations notify the customer in the event of a breach. This legislation protects broad categories of data, including, social security numbers and other government-issued identification numbers; financial account information, including credit card numbers and bank accounts; online usernames and passwords, including email names and passwords; unique biometric data, including fingerprints; information about a person’s physical and mental health; information about geolocation; and access to private digital photographs and videos.

I understand that not every breach can be prevented. Cyber criminals are determined and constantly looking for new ways to pierce the most sophisticated security systems. But just as we expect a bank to put a lock on the front door and an alarm on the vault to protect its customers’ money, we expect corporations to take reasonable measures to protect the personal information they collect from us. Unfortu-

nately, many of the corporations that profit from the very information that we entrust them to protect, have woefully inadequate measures to secure this information. For others, security is simply not a priority. American consumers deserve better.

This legislation creates civil penalties for corporations that fail to meet the required privacy and data security standards established in the bill or fail to notify customers when a breach occurs. The Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the State Attorneys General each have a role in enforcement. This legislation also requires corporations to inform Federal law enforcement, such as the Secret Service and the FBI, of all large data breaches, as well as breaches that could impact the federal government. Such notification is necessary to help law enforcement bring these cyber criminals to justice and identify patterns that help protect against future attacks.

Many Americans understandably assume Federal law already protects this sensitive information—common sense tells us that it should. Unfortunately, the reality is that it does not. States provide a patchwork of protection, and while some laws are strong, others are not. For example, 47 States and the District of Columbia require some form of data breach notification, but only 12 States have passed data security requirements designed to prevent data breaches. My home state of Vermont has a strong data breach notification law that has been in effect since 2007.

In crafting Federal law, we must be careful not to override the strong State laws that took years to accomplish with weaker Federal protections, but we also need to ensure that all Americans, regardless of where they live, have their privacy protected. To this end, the Consumer Privacy Protection Act preempts State law relating to data security and data breach notification only to the extent that the protections under those laws are weaker than those provided for in this bill. We must ensure that consumers do not lose privacy protections they currently enjoy. Since this bill is modeled after those States with the strongest consumer protections, however, I believe it will improve protections for consumers in nearly every State.

I am joined today by Senators FRANKEN, WARREN, BLUMENTHAL, WYDEN, and MARKEY in introducing this legislation. These Senators have long shared my commitment to protecting consumer privacy. This legislation also has the support of leading consumer privacy advocates, including: Center for Democracy and Technology, Consumers Union, National Consumers League, New America’s Open Technology Institute, Consumer Federation of America, and Privacy Rights Clearinghouse.

Millions of Americans who have had their personal information compromised or stolen as a result of a data

breach consider this issue to be of critical importance and a priority for the Senate. Protecting privacy rights should be important to all of us, regardless of party or ideology. I hope that all Senators will support this measure to better protect Americans' privacy.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1169. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Reauthorization Act of 2015. Senator WHITEHOUSE is joining me in this effort.

This measure would improve our Nation's response to juvenile offenders in the criminal justice system.

For the last 40 or so years, the Federal Government, through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, or JJDP, has provided guidelines and resources to help States serve troubled adolescents.

This 1974 law provides juvenile justice dollars to States and sets four core requirements for States that choose to accept these Federal funds. The law also created the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention at the Justice Department.

A centerpiece of the current statute is its standards for the treatment of at-risk youth who come into contact with our criminal justice system. But these standards have not been updated since 2002, and the law's authorization has expired.

Since Congress last extended the law more than a dozen years ago, evidence has emerged that some of the JJDP's provisions need to be improved or strengthened to reflect the latest research on adolescent development.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have made this law's renewal a priority. The bill I am introducing would extend the statute for 5 years and update its provisions to reflect the latest research on what works with troubled adolescents.

The bill also would continue Congress's commitment to help State and local jurisdictions improve their juvenile justice systems through a program of formula grants. At the same time, the bill would improve the oversight and accountability of this grant program in several key ways.

Such accountability measures are vitally needed to ensure the grant program's integrity.

The Senate Judiciary Committee heard testimony from whistleblowers last week that the Justice Department is failing to hold participating States accountable for meeting the JJDP's four core requirements.

After I wrote several letters concerning these whistleblower allegations, the Justice Department admit-

ted to having a flawed compliance monitoring policy in place since 1997. This policy allowed States to receive JJDP formula grants in violation of the law's funding requirements.

Witnesses at last week's Senate Judiciary hearing recounted violations of law, mismanagement, and waste of limited juvenile justice grant funds, in addition to retaliation against whistleblowers.

This is an injustice not only to the taxpayers but also to the youth who face inadequate juvenile justice systems. It is also an injustice to the children who end up in the justice system as a result of poor experience in the foster care system.

Shortcomings in the juvenile justice system will not be solved overnight. But I look forward to taking the lead on legislation in the 114th Congress that will make measurable improvements.

In closing, numerous organizations have worked with us on the development of this bill, and I thank them for their contributions. I also thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his cosponsorship of the legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1170. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to reauthorize the Breast Cancer Research Stamp for 4 more years.

Without Congressional action, this important and effective way of raising additional funds for critical research will expire at the end of this year. These stamps are sold for a little more than the cost of first class postage, so customers can choose to donate in a simple and easy way.

Since 1998, more than 986 million breast cancer research stamps have been sold, raising over \$80.4 million for breast cancer research. The funds have gone to support breast cancer research at both the National Institutes of Health, NIH, and the Department of Defense.

For example, the National Institutes of Health has used proceeds from the Breast Cancer Research Stamp to fund the Maternal Pregnancy Factors and Breast Cancer Risk Study. This study was designed to identify possible connections between various conditions during pregnancy and breast cancer risk. After comparing information from women who delivered babies and were later diagnosed with breast cancer to women who delivered babies and were not diagnosed with breast cancer, researchers found that factors like preeclampsia or carrying twins may in-

crease cancer risk. Knowing these risk factors helps both doctors and patients be vigilant about early screening.

Thanks to breakthroughs in cancer research, more and more breast cancer patients are becoming survivors. Nearly all patients with breast cancer caught in the early stages now survive. That is incredible, and a testament to how important this research has been.

Though despite our great successes, the need for continued research and improved screening and treatments remains high.

Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women in the U.S. and the second leading cause of cancer deaths. One in eight women will be diagnosed, and more than 40,000 die from the disease each year.

Though male breast cancer is less common, an estimated 2,350 men will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year.

The Breast Cancer Research Stamp provides a simple, convenient way for Americans to contribute toward this vitally important research. It also provides a symbol of hope for those affected by this disease.

I thank Senator ENZI for joining me to support this bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to join us and ensure the stamp continues for another 4 years.

This bill is supported by organizations including: the American Association of Cancer Research, AACR, American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, ACS CAN, American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology, ACOG, American College of Surgeons, Are You Defense Advocacy, Breast Cancer Fund, Breast Cancer Research Foundation, Center for Women Policy Studies, Susan G. Komen, and the Tigerlily Foundation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 156—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO CHILDHOOD STROKE AND RECOGNIZING MAY 2015 AS "NATIONAL PEDIATRIC STROKE AWARENESS MONTH"

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 156

Whereas a stroke, also known as cerebrovascular disease, is an acute neurologic injury that occurs when the blood supply to a part of the brain is interrupted by a clot in the artery or a burst of the artery;

Whereas a stroke is a medical emergency that can cause permanent neurologic damage or even death if not promptly diagnosed and treated;

Whereas a stroke occurs in approximately 1 out of every 3,500 live births, and 4.6 out of 100,000 children ages 19 and under experience a stroke each year;

Whereas a stroke can occur before birth;

Whereas stroke is among the top 12 causes of death for children between the ages of 1 and 14 in the United States;

Whereas 20 to 40 percent of children who have suffered a stroke die as a result;

Whereas a stroke recurs within 5 years in 10 percent of children who have had an ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke;

Whereas the death rate for children who experience a stroke before the age of 1 is the highest out of all child age groups;

Whereas there are no approved therapies for the treatment of acute stroke in infants and children;

Whereas approximately 60 percent of infants and children who have a pediatric stroke will have serious, permanent neurological disabilities, including paralysis, seizures, speech and vision problems, and attention, learning, and behavioral difficulties;

Whereas such disabilities may require ongoing physical therapy and surgeries;

Whereas the permanent health concerns of and treatments for strokes that occur during childhood and young adulthood have considerable impacts on children, families, and society;

Whereas more information is necessary regarding the cause, treatment, and prevention of pediatric strokes;

Whereas medical research is the only means by which the people of the United States can identify and develop effective treatment and prevention strategies for pediatric strokes; and

Whereas early diagnosis and treatment of pediatric strokes greatly improves the chances that an affected child will recover and not experience a recurrence of a stroke: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes May 2015 as “National Pediatric Stroke Awareness Month”;

(2) urges the people of the United States to support the efforts, programs, services, and organizations that enhance public awareness of pediatric stroke;

(3) supports the work of the National Institutes of Health in pursuit of medical progress on pediatric stroke; and

(4) urges continued coordination and cooperation between the Federal Government, State and local governments, researchers, families, and the public to improve treatments and prognoses for children who suffer from strokes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 157—RECOGNIZING THE ECONOMIC, CULTURAL, AND POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SOUTHEAST-ASIAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY ON THE 40TH ANNIVERSARIES OF THE BEGINNING OF KHMER ROUGE CONTROL OVER CAMBODIA AND THE BEGINNING OF THE CAMBODIAN GENOCIDE AND THE END OF THE VIETNAM WAR AND THE “SECRET WAR” IN THE KINGDOM OF LAOS

Ms. HIRONO submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 157

Whereas April 17, 2015, marks the 40th anniversary of the beginning of Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide;

Whereas April 30, 2015, marks the 40th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War;

Whereas December 2, 2015, marks the 40th anniversary of the end of the “Secret War” in which Communists declared victory over

the Kingdom of Laos and established a Communist regime in that country;

Whereas those historic events led to the forced migration to the United States, after 1975, of over 1,000,000 refugees from Cambodia, the Kingdom of Laos, and Vietnam;

Whereas over 600,000 Vietnamese refugees were resettled in the United States, many of whom had worked with the United States Government as translators and civil servants during the Vietnam War and were paroled into the United States after the enactment of the Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-23), and in the 1990s, over 30,000 survivors of Communist reeducation camps and 150,000 family members of those survivors were resettled in the United States;

Whereas approximately 250,000 refugees from the Kingdom of Laos were resettled in the United States, many of whom assisted the war effort of the United States during the “Secret War” in Laos, including 35,000 individuals who served as Special Guerrilla Unit fighters in the surrogate army for the United States and others who served as civil servants;

Whereas at least 115,000 Cambodian refugees were resettled in the United States after 1 of the worst genocides of the 20th century, during which about 20 percent of the Cambodian population perished;

Whereas the exodus of refugees from Southeast Asia prompted the United States to enact the Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-212) and establish the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which established the first formal refugee resettlement system in the United States;

Whereas the Office of Refugee Resettlement recognized the critical importance of Southeast Asian American Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs) with the establishment in 1980 of a special grant program that lay the groundwork for a strong network of Southeast-Asian American community-based organizations in the United States;

Whereas, as of April 2015, over 2,500,000 Southeast-Asian Americans trace their heritage to Cambodia, the Kingdom of Laos, and Vietnam;

Whereas Southeast-Asian Americans include a broad diversity of ethnic groups, including—

(1) Cham, Khmer, and Khmer Loeu from Cambodia;

(2) Hmong, Iu-Mien, Khmu, Taidam, and Lao Theung from the Kingdom of Laos; and

(3) ethnic Khmer, Montagnards, and Vietnamese from Vietnam; and

Whereas Southeast-Asian Americans—

(1) have blazed trails to own small businesses, lead community-based organizations, serve in public office, and nurture emerging leaders;

(2) carry on a rich cultural tradition of music and dance, and pioneer hybrid art forms such as spoken word poetry and hip-hop;

(3) continue to face significant challenges to full economic and social empowerment, such as low rates of high school completion, high rates of poverty, and disproportionate rates of arrest and incarceration; and

(4) remain resilient, rooted both in Southeast-Asian heritage and in the society of the United States, and rising toward a hopeful, equitable future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of the 40th anniversaries of—

(A) the beginning of the Khmer Rouge rule in Cambodia and the Cambodian Genocide;

(B) the end of the Vietnam War and the “Secret War” in Laos;

(C) the humanitarian response of the people and Government of the United States to receive over 1,000,000 refugees from Southeast Asia; and

(D) the beginning of the Southeast-Asian American community in the United States; and

(2) recognizes the ongoing contributions of the Southeast-Asian American community to the economic, cultural, and political vitality of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 158—RECOGNIZING THE CULTURAL AND HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CINCO DE MAYO HOLIDAY

Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 158

Whereas May 5, or “Cinco de Mayo” in Spanish, is celebrated each year as a date of importance by Mexican and Mexican-American communities;

Whereas the Cinco de Mayo holiday commemorates May 5, 1862, the date on which Mexicans defeated the French at the Battle of Puebla, one of the many battles that the Mexican people won in their long and brave fight for independence, freedom, and democracy;

Whereas the victory of Mexico over France at Puebla represented a historic triumph for the Mexican government during the Franco-Mexican war of 1861-1867 and bolstered the resistance movement;

Whereas the success of Mexico at the Battle of Puebla reinvigorated the spirits of the Mexican people and provided a renewed sense of unity and strength;

Whereas the French army, which had not experienced defeat against any of the finest troops of Europe in more than half a century, sustained a disastrous loss at the hands of an outnumbered and ill-equipped, but highly spirited and courageous, Mexican army;

Whereas the courageous spirit that Mexican General Ignacio Zaragoza and his men displayed during that historic battle can never be forgotten;

Whereas, in a larger sense, Cinco de Mayo symbolizes the right of a free people to self-determination, just as Benito Juarez, the president of Mexico during the Battle of Puebla, once said, “El respeto al derecho ajeno es la paz”, meaning “respect for the rights of others is peace”;

Whereas the sacrifice of Mexican fighters was instrumental in keeping Mexico from falling under European domination while, in the United States, the Union Army battled Confederate forces in the Civil War;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder that the foundation of the United States was built by people from many countries and diverse cultures who were willing to fight and die for freedom;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo also serves as a reminder of the close ties between the people of Mexico and the people of the United States;

Whereas Cinco de Mayo encourages the celebration of a legacy of strong leaders and a sense of vibrancy in communities; and

Whereas Cinco de Mayo serves as a reminder to provide more opportunity for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historic struggle of the people of Mexico for independence and freedom, which Cinco de Mayo commemorates; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe Cinco de Mayo with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 159—DESIGNATING APRIL 2015, AS “NATIONAL 9-1-1 EDUCATION MONTH”

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 159

Whereas 9-1-1 is recognized throughout the United States as the number to call in an emergency to receive immediate help from police, fire, emergency medical services, or other appropriate emergency response entities;

Whereas, in 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended that a “single number should be established” nationwide for reporting emergency situations, and various Federal Government agencies and governmental officials supported and encouraged the recommendation;

Whereas, in 1968, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (commonly known as “AT&T”) announced that it would establish the digits 9-1-1 as the emergency code throughout the United States;

Whereas Congress designated 9-1-1 as the national emergency call number in the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-81; 113 Stat. 1286);

Whereas section 102 of the ENHANCE 911 Act of 2004 (47 U.S.C. 942 note) declared an enhanced 9-1-1 system to be “a high national priority” and part of “our Nation's homeland security and public safety”;

Whereas it is important that policy makers at all levels of government understand the importance of 9-1-1, how the 9-1-1 system works, and the steps that are needed to modernize the 9-1-1 system;

Whereas the 9-1-1 system is the connection between the eyes and ears of the public and the emergency response system in the United States and is often the first place emergencies of all magnitudes are reported, making 9-1-1 a significant homeland security asset;

Whereas more than 6,000 9-1-1 public safety answering points serve more than 3,000 counties and parishes throughout the United States;

Whereas telecommunications at public safety answering points answer more than 200,000,000 9-1-1 calls each year in the United States;

Whereas a growing number of 9-1-1 calls are made using wireless and Internet Protocol-based communications services;

Whereas a growing segment of the population of the United States, including individuals who are deaf, hard of hearing, or deaf-blind, or have speech disabilities, is increasingly communicating with nontraditional text, video, and instant messaging communications services and expects those services to be able to connect directly to 9-1-1;

Whereas the growth and variety of means of communication, including mobile and Internet Protocol-based systems, impose challenges for accessing 9-1-1 and implementing an enhanced 9-1-1 system and require increased education and awareness about the capabilities of different means of communication;

Whereas numerous other “N-1-1” and 800 number services exist for nonemergency situations, including 2-1-1, 3-1-1, 5-1-1, 7-1-1, 8-1-1, poison control centers, and mental health hotlines, and the public needs to be educated on when to use those services in addition to or instead of 9-1-1;

Whereas international visitors and immigrants make up an increasing percentage of the population of the United States each

year, and visitors and immigrants may have limited knowledge of the emergency calling system in the United States;

Whereas people of all ages use 9-1-1 and it is critical to educate people on the proper use of 9-1-1;

Whereas senior citizens are highly likely to need to access 9-1-1 and many senior citizens are learning to use new technology;

Whereas thousands of 9-1-1 calls are made every year by children properly trained in the use of 9-1-1, which saves lives and underscores the critical importance of training children early in life about 9-1-1;

Whereas the 9-1-1 system is often misused, including by the placement of prank and nonemergency calls;

Whereas misuse of the 9-1-1 system results in costly and inefficient use of 9-1-1 and emergency response resources and needs to be reduced;

Whereas parents, teachers, and all other caregivers need to play an active role in 9-1-1 education for children, but can do so only after first being educated themselves;

Whereas there are many avenues for 9-1-1 public education, including safety fairs, school presentations, libraries, churches, businesses, public safety answering point tours or open houses, civic organizations, and senior citizen centers;

Whereas children, parents, teachers, and the National Parent Teacher Association make vital contributions to the education of children about the importance of 9-1-1 through targeted outreach efforts to public and private school systems;

Whereas the United States should strive to host at least 1 educational event regarding the proper use of 9-1-1 in every school in the country every year;

Whereas programs to promote proper use of 9-1-1 during National 9-1-1 Education Month could include—

(1) public awareness events, including conferences, media outreach, and training activities for parents, teachers, school administrators, other caregivers, and businesses;

(2) educational events in schools and other appropriate venues; and

(3) production and distribution of information about the 9-1-1 system designed to educate people of all ages on the importance and proper use of 9-1-1; and

Whereas the people of the United States deserve the best education regarding the use of 9-1-1: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2015 as “National 9-1-1 Education Month”; and

(2) urges governmental officials, parents, teachers, school administrators, caregivers, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies, training events, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 160—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT PUBLIC SERVANTS SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR DEDICATION AND CONTINUED SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES DURING PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TESTER, Mr. COONS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 160

Whereas the week of May 3 through 9, 2015 has been designated as “Public Service Recognition Week” to honor employees of the Federal Government and State and local governments and members of the uniformed services;

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week provides an opportunity to recognize and promote the important contributions of public servants and honor the diverse men and women who meet the needs of the United States through work at all levels of government and as members of the uniformed services;

Whereas millions of individuals work in government service, and as members of the uniformed services, in every State, county, and city across the United States and in hundreds of cities abroad;

Whereas public service is a noble calling involving a variety of challenging and rewarding professions;

Whereas the ability of the Federal Government and State and local governments to be responsive, innovative, and effective depends on outstanding performance of dedicated public servants;

Whereas the United States is a great and prosperous country, and public service employees contribute significantly to that greatness and prosperity;

Whereas the United States benefits daily from the knowledge and skills of the highly-trained individuals who work in public service;

Whereas public servants—

(1) defend the freedom of the people of the United States and advance the interests of the United States around the world;

(2) provide vital strategic support functions to the Armed Forces and serve in the National Guard and Reserves;

(3) fight crime and fires;

(4) ensure equal access to secure, efficient, and affordable mail service;

(5) deliver benefits under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), including benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(6) fight disease and promote better health;

(7) protect the environment and the parks of the United States;

(8) enforce laws guaranteeing equal employment opportunity and healthy working conditions;

(9) defend and secure critical infrastructure;

(10) help the people of the United States recover from natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(11) teach and work in schools and libraries;

(12) develop new technologies and explore the Earth, the Moon, and space to help improve knowledge on how the world changes;

(13) improve and secure transportation systems;

(14) promote economic growth; and

(15) assist veterans of the Armed Forces;

Whereas members of the uniformed services and civilian employees at all levels of government make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States, and are on the front lines in the fight to defeat terrorism and maintain homeland security;

Whereas public servants work in a professional manner to build relationships with other countries and cultures in order to better represent the interests and promote the ideals of the United States;

Whereas public servants alert Congress and the public to government waste, fraud, and abuse, and of dangers to public health;

Whereas the individuals serving in the uniformed services, as well as the skilled trade

and craft employees of the Federal Government who provide support to their efforts, are committed to doing their jobs regardless of the circumstances, and contribute greatly to the security of the United States and the world;

Whereas public servants have bravely fought in armed conflicts in the defense of the United States and its ideals, and deserve the care and benefits they have earned through their honorable service;

Whereas public servants have much to offer, as demonstrated by their expertise and innovative ideas, and serve as examples by passing on institutional knowledge to train the next generation of public servants; and

Whereas the week of May 3 through 9, 2015 marks the 31st anniversary of Public Service Recognition Week; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week of May 3 through 9, 2015 as “Public Service Recognition Week”;

(2) commends public servants for their outstanding contributions to this great country during Public Service Recognition Week and throughout the year;

(3) salutes government employees, and members of the uniformed services, for their unyielding dedication to and enthusiasm for public service;

(4) honors government employees and members of the uniformed services who have given their lives in service to their country;

(5) calls upon a new generation to consider a career in public service as an honorable profession; and

(6) encourages efforts to promote public service careers at all levels of government.

SENATE RESOLUTION 161—DESIGNATING APRIL 2015 AS “FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH”

Mr. REED of Rhode Island (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 161

Whereas according to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (referred to in this preamble as the “FDIC”), at least 27.7 percent of households in the United States, or nearly 34,400,000 households with approximately 67,600,000 adults, are unbanked or underbanked and therefore have not had the opportunity to access savings, lending, and other basic financial services;

Whereas according to the FDIC, approximately 30 percent of banks reported in 2011 that consumers lacked understanding of the financial products and services banks offered;

Whereas according to the 2014 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey Final Report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling—

(1) approximately 41 percent of adults in the United States gave themselves a grade of C, D, or F on their knowledge of personal finance, and 73 percent of adults acknowledged that they could benefit from additional advice and answers to everyday financial questions from a professional;

(2) 24 percent of adults in the United States, or approximately 56,300,000 individuals, admitted to not paying their bills on time;

(3) only 39 percent of adults in the United States reported keeping close track of their

spending, a percentage that has held steady since 2007; and

(4) 16 percent of adults in the United States, or over 37,500,000 individuals, said not having enough “rainy day” savings for an emergency is their greatest financial concern, while the same percentage said that their greatest financial concern is not having enough money set aside for retirement;

Whereas the 2014 Retirement Confidence Survey conducted by the Employee Benefit Research Institute found that only 18 percent of workers were “very confident” about having enough money for a comfortable retirement, which is a sharp decline in worker confidence from the 27 percent of workers who were “very confident” in 2007, while approximately 56 percent of workers say they or their spouses have not calculated the amount of money they need to save for retirement;

Whereas according to a 2015 “Flow of Funds” report by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, outstanding household debt in the United States was \$13,500,000,000,000 at the end of the fourth quarter of 2014;

Whereas according to the 2014 Survey of the States: Economic and Personal Finance Education in Our Nation’s Schools, a biennial report by the Council for Economic Education—

(1) only 24 States require students to take an economics course as a high school graduation requirement; and

(2) only 17 States require students to take a personal finance course either independently or as part of an economics course as a high school graduation requirement;

Whereas according to the Gallup-Operation HOPE Financial Literacy Index, only 58 percent of students in the United States have money in a bank or credit union account;

Whereas expanding access to the safe, mainstream financial system will provide individuals with less expensive and more secure options for managing finances and building wealth;

Whereas quality personal financial education is essential to ensure that individuals are prepared to manage money, credit, and debt, and to become responsible workers, heads of household, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens;

Whereas increased financial literacy empowers individuals to make wise financial decisions and reduces the confusion caused by an increasingly complex economy;

Whereas a greater understanding of, and familiarity with, financial markets and institutions will lead to increased economic activity and growth;

Whereas in 2003, Congress determined that coordinating Federal financial literacy efforts and formulating a national strategy is important; and

Whereas in light of that determination, Congress passed the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9701 et seq.), establishing the Financial Literacy and Education Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2015 as “Financial Literacy Month” to raise public awareness about—

(A) the importance of personal financial education in the United States; and

(B) the serious consequences that may result from a lack of understanding about personal finances; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe Financial Literacy Month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 162—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF ALCOHOL RESPONSIBILITY MONTH

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. HELLER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 162

Whereas, in 2013, an estimated 10,076 people were killed in the United States in drunk driving crashes involving a driver with a blood alcohol content of .08 or greater, impacting countless family members, friends, and communities;

Whereas, in 2013, 1 person died in a drunk driving crash every 52 minutes, on average;

Whereas, in 2013, approximately 8,700,000 people of the United States between the ages of 12 and 20, or nearly 23 percent of the age group for whom alcohol consumption is illegal, reported consuming alcohol during the preceding 30 days;

Whereas research shows that a lifetime of conversations between parents and their children about alcohol, beginning at an early age, can help prevent underage drinking and alcohol abuse;

Whereas the potential danger for young people to be involved in alcohol-related crashes escalates during prom and graduation season;

Whereas many State attorneys general are launching underage drinking prevention messages and programs in their States and communities; and

Whereas April has been dedicated to alcohol awareness for the last 28 years, and more than awareness is needed to further reduce drunk driving and underage drinking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares April to be Alcohol Responsibility Month and supports the goal of encouraging responsible decision-making regarding beverage alcohol;

(2) encourages parents to be responsible role models and to have ongoing conversations with their children throughout their childhood, adolescence, and early adulthood about the dangers of alcohol abuse;

(3) condemns the pervasiveness of alcohol-impaired driving and resulting tragedies; and

(4) promotes the responsible consumption of alcohol by adults in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 163—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE HUMANITARIAN CATASTROPHE CAUSED BY THE APRIL 25, 2015, EARTHQUAKE IN NEPAL

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 163

Whereas, on April 25, 2015, an earthquake measuring 7.8 on the Richter scale and the aftershocks of the earthquake devastated Kathmandu, Nepal and the surrounding areas, killing thousands, injuring thousands more people, and leaving many thousands of people homeless;

Whereas the earthquake also resulted in the loss of life and destruction of property in India, Bangladesh, and the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China;

Whereas United States citizens were also killed in the wide-scale destruction caused by the earthquake;

Whereas Nepal, which is one of the poorest countries in the world, has an estimated 25 percent of the population living on less than \$1.25 a day, has an estimated 46 percent unemployment rate with a majority of the population engaged in subsistence agriculture, and has one of the slowest economic growth rates in the region;

Whereas years of civil conflict in Nepal led to a massive influx of people into urban areas despite the absence of appropriate facilities, roads, housing, and infrastructure to support the people;

Whereas, since the end of hostilities, political gridlock among the leadership of Nepal to finalize a constitution has stymied growth and development;

Whereas the loss of infrastructure will further inhibit economic growth in the impoverished country of Nepal;

Whereas the United States Government has worked with the Government of Nepal on disaster risk reduction and earthquake preparedness for years, which certainly saved many lives and accelerated the ability of the Government and people of Nepal to respond to disasters and earthquakes;

Whereas the United States Government and the international community are mounting a large-scale response and recovery effort; and

Whereas the United States Agency for International Development is leading the response of the United States by providing a Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART), funding, and Urban Search and Rescue experts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses profound sympathy to, and unwavering support for, the people of Nepal, India, Bangladesh, and the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China, who have always shown resilience and now face catastrophic conditions in the aftermath of the April 25, 2015, earthquake, and sympathy for the families of the citizens of the United States who perished in the disaster;

(2) applauds the rapid and concerted mobilization by President Barack Obama to provide immediate emergency humanitarian assistance to Nepal, and the hard work and dedication of the people at the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense in quickly marshaling United States Government resources to address both the short- and long-term needs in Nepal;

(3) urges that all appropriate efforts be made to secure the safety of orphans in Nepal;

(4) urges that all appropriate efforts be made to sustain recovery assistance to Nepal beyond the immediate humanitarian crisis to support the people of Nepal with appropriate humanitarian, developmental, and infrastructure assistance needed to overcome the effects of the earthquake;

(5) expresses appreciation for the ongoing and renewed commitment of the international community to the recovery and development of Nepal;

(6) urges all countries to commit to assisting the people of Nepal with their long-term needs;

(7) calls on the Government of Nepal to take all necessary actions to enable a faster and more sustainable recovery; and

(8) expresses support for the United States Embassy team in Kathmandu, DART members, other Federal agencies, and the non governmental organization community in the United States, who are valiantly working to assist thousands of people in Nepal under extremely adverse conditions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 164—DESIGNATING APRIL 30, 2015, AS DÍA DE LOS NIÑOS: CELEBRATING YOUNG AMERICANS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 164

Whereas each year, people in many countries throughout the world, and especially in the Western Hemisphere, celebrate Día de los Niños, or Day of the Children, on April 30th in recognition and celebration of the future of their country—their children;

Whereas children represent the hopes and dreams of the people of the United States, and the well-being of children remains one of the top priorities of the United States;

Whereas the people of the United States must nurture and invest in children to preserve and enhance economic prosperity, democracy, and the spirit of the United States;

Whereas in 2013, the Census Bureau estimated that approximately 17,800,000 of the nearly 54,000,000 individuals of Hispanic descent living in the United States are children under 18 years of age, representing $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total Hispanic population residing in the United States and roughly $\frac{1}{4}$ of the total population of children in the United States;

Whereas Hispanic Americans, the youngest and largest racial or ethnic minority group in the United States, celebrate the tradition of honoring their children on Día de los Niños and wish to share this custom with all people of the United States;

Whereas, as the United States becomes more culturally and ethnically diverse, the people of the United States must strive to create opportunities that provide dignity and upward mobility for all children;

Whereas the primary teachers of family values, morality, and culture are parents and family members, and children are responsible for passing on family values, morality, and culture to future generations;

Whereas the importance of literacy and education is most often communicated to children through family members;

Whereas the latest data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) indicates that Latino students continue to score lower than the national average on reading assessments conducted at the elementary school, middle school, and high school levels—an achievement gap that has persisted for decades;

Whereas the most recent data by NAEP demonstrates that 81 percent of Latino fourth graders in public schools are not proficient in reading;

Whereas Latino authors and Latino protagonists remain underrepresented in literature for children, and less than 3 percent of books for children are written by Latino authors, illustrated by Latino book creators, or feature significant Latino cultural content, even though $\frac{1}{4}$ of all public school children are Latino;

Whereas research has shown that culturally relevant literature can increase student engagement and reading comprehension, yet some Latino students may go their entire educational experience without seeing themselves portrayed positively in the books that they read and the stories that they hear;

Whereas increasing the number and proportion of multicultural authors in literature for children elevates the voices of the growing diverse communities in the United States and can serve as an effective

strategy for closing the reading proficiency achievement gap;

Whereas addressing the widening disparities that still exist among children is of paramount importance to the economic prosperity of the United States;

Whereas the designation of a day to honor the children of the United States will help affirm the significance of family, education, and community among the people of the United States;

Whereas the designation of a day of special recognition for the children of the United States will provide an opportunity for children to reflect on their futures, articulate their aspirations, and find comfort and security in the support of their family members and communities;

Whereas families should be encouraged to engage in family and community activities that include extended and elderly family members and encourage children to explore and develop confidence;

Whereas the National Latino Children's Institute (NLCI), serving as a voice for children, has worked with cities throughout the United States to declare April 30, 2015, as Día de los Niños: Celebrating Young Americans, a day to bring together Latinos and communities across the United States to celebrate and uplift children; and

Whereas the people of the United States should be encouraged to celebrate the gifts of children to society and invest in future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 30, 2015, as Día de los Niños: Celebrating Young Americans; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to join with all children, families, organizations, communities, churches, cities, and States across the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies, including activities that—

(A) center around children and are free or minimal in cost so as to encourage and facilitate the participation of all people;

(B) are positive and uplifting, and help children express their hopes and dreams;

(C) provide opportunities for children of all backgrounds to learn about each other's cultures and share ideas;

(D) include all family members, especially extended and elderly family members, so as to promote greater communication among the generations within families, which will enable children to appreciate and benefit from the experiences and wisdom of elderly family members;

(E) provide opportunities for families within a community to build relationships; and

(F) provide children with the support they need to develop skills and confidence, and to find the inner strength, will, and fire of the human spirit to make their dreams come true.

SENATE RESOLUTION 165—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORLD MALARIA DAY

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 165

Whereas April 25th of each year is recognized internationally as World Malaria Day;

Whereas malaria is a leading cause of death and disease in many developing countries, despite being preventable and treatable;

Whereas fighting malaria is in the national interest of the United States, as reducing the risk of malaria protects members of the Armed Forces of the United States and other people of the United States serving overseas in malaria-endemic regions, and reducing malaria deaths helps to lower risks of instability in less developed countries;

Whereas support for efforts to fight malaria is in the diplomatic and moral interest of the United States, as that support generates goodwill toward the United States and highlights the values of the people of the United States through the work of governmental, nongovernmental, and faith-based organizations of the United States;

Whereas efforts to fight malaria are in the long-term economic interest of the United States because those efforts help developing countries—

- (1) identify at-risk populations;
- (2) provide a framework for critical emergency disease treatment;
- (3) provide better health services;
- (4) increase local governance needed to address substandard and counterfeit medicines that exacerbate malaria resistance;
- (5) produce healthier and more productive workforces;
- (6) advance economic development; and
- (7) promote stronger trading partners;

Whereas malaria transmission occurred in 97 countries and territories in 2014, and an estimated 3,200,000,000 people are at risk for malaria, the majority of whom are in sub-Saharan Africa, which accounts for 90 percent of malaria deaths in the world;

Whereas young children and pregnant women are particularly vulnerable to and disproportionately affected by malaria;

Whereas malaria greatly affects the health of children, as children under the age of 5 account for an estimated 78 percent of malaria deaths each year;

Whereas malaria poses great risks to maternal and neonatal health, causing complications during delivery, anemia, and low birth weights, and estimates indicate that malaria infection causes approximately 400,000 cases of severe maternal anemia and between 75,000 and 200,000 infant deaths annually in sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas heightened national, regional, and international efforts to prevent and treat malaria during recent years have made significant progress and helped save hundreds of thousands of lives;

Whereas the World Malaria Report 2014 by the World Health Organization states that in 2013, approximately 49 percent of households in sub-Saharan Africa owned at least one insecticide-treated mosquito net, and household surveys indicated that 90 percent of people used an insecticide-treated mosquito net if one was available in the household;

Whereas, in 2013, approximately 123,000,000 people were protected by indoor residual spraying;

Whereas the World Malaria Report 2014 further states that between 2000 and 2013—

- (1) malaria mortality rates decreased by 47 percent around the world;
- (2) in the African Region of the World Health Organization, malaria mortality rates decreased by 54 percent; and
- (3) an estimated 4,300,000 malaria deaths were averted globally, primarily as a result of increased interventions;

Whereas the World Malaria Report 2014 further states that out of 97 countries with ongoing transmission of malaria in 2014—

- (1) 10 countries are classified as being in the pre-elimination phase;
- (2) 9 countries are classified as being in the elimination phase; and
- (3) 7 countries are classified as being in the prevention of malaria reintroduction phase of malaria control;

Whereas continued national, regional, and international investment in efforts to eliminate malaria, including prevention and treatment efforts, the development of a vaccine to immunize children from the malaria parasite, and advancements in insecticides, are critical in order to continue to reduce malaria deaths, prevent backsliding in areas where progress has been made, and equip the United States and the global community with the tools necessary to fight malaria and other global health threats;

Whereas the United States Government has played a leading role in the recent progress made toward reducing the global burden of malaria, particularly through the President's Malaria Initiative (referred to in this preamble as the "PMI") and the contribution of the United States to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria;

Whereas, in May 2011, an independent, external evaluation, prepared by Boston University, examining 6 objectives of the PMI, found the PMI to be a successful, well-led program that has "earned and deserves the task of sustaining and expanding the United States Government's response to global malaria control efforts";

Whereas the United States Government is pursuing a comprehensive approach to ending malaria deaths through the PMI, which is led by the United States Agency for International Development and implemented with assistance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of State, the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, and private sector entities;

Whereas the PMI focuses on helping partner countries achieve major improvements in overall health outcomes through improved access to, and quality of, healthcare services in locations with limited resources; and

Whereas the PMI, recognizing the burden of malaria on many partner countries, has set a target by 2020 of reducing malaria mortality by $\frac{1}{3}$ from 2015 levels in PMI-supported countries, achieving a greater than 80 percent reduction from original 2000 baseline levels set by the PMI, reducing malaria morbidity in PMI-supported countries by 40 percent from 2015 levels, and assisting at least 5 PMI-supported countries to meet the criteria of the World Health Organization for national or sub-national pre-elimination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day;

(2) recognizes the importance of reducing malaria prevalence and deaths to improve overall child and maternal health, especially in sub-Saharan Africa;

(3) commends the recent progress made toward reducing global malaria morbidity, mortality, and prevalence, particularly through the efforts of the President's Malaria Initiative and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria;

(4) welcomes ongoing public-private partnerships to research and develop more effective and affordable tools for malaria diagnosis, treatment, and vaccination;

(5) recognizes the goals, priorities, and authorities to combat malaria set forth in the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-293; 122 Stat. 2918);

(6) supports continued leadership by the United States in bilateral, multilateral, and private sector efforts to combat malaria and to work with developing countries to create long-term strategies to increase ownership over malaria programs; and

(7) encourages other members of the international community to sustain and increase their support for and financial contributions to efforts to combat malaria worldwide.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14—PROVIDING THAT THE PRESIDENT MAY NOT PROVIDE SANCTIONS RELIEF TO IRAN UNTIL CERTAIN UNITED STATES CITIZENS ARE RELEASED FROM IRAN

Mr. RISCH submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 14

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement with Iran relating to Iran's nuclear program until the Government of Iran releases to the United States the following United States citizens:

- (1) Saeed Abedini of Idaho, who has been detained in Iran on charges related to his religious beliefs since September 2012.
- (2) Amir Hekmati of Michigan, who has been imprisoned in Iran on false espionage charges since August 2011.
- (3) Jason Rezaian of California, who, as an Iranian government credentialed reporter for the Washington Post, has been unjustly held in Iran on vague charges since July 2014.
- (4) Robert Levinson of Florida, who was abducted on Kish Island in March 2007.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1196. Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1197. Mr. COTTON proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1191, *supra*.

SA 1198. Mr. COTTON (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1197 proposed by Mr. COTTON to the bill H.R. 1191, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1196. Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 11, strike line 16 and all that follows through "significant breach" on page 12, line 4, and insert the following:

"(2) POTENTIAL BREACHES AND COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS.—The President shall, within 10

calendar days of receiving credible information relating to a potential breach or potentially significant compliance incident by Iran with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a), submit such information to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

“(3) MATERIAL BREACH REPORT.—Not later than 30 calendar days after submitting information about a potential breach or potentially significant compliance incident pursuant to paragraph (2), the President shall make a determination whether such potential breach

SA 1197. Mr. COTTON proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 3 and all that follows through “this section” on page 4, line 7, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN RELATING TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 134 the following new section:

“SEC. 135. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.

“(a) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN AND VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT WITH RESPECT TO SUCH AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS.—Not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership—

“(A) the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes;

“(B) a verification assessment report of the Secretary of State prepared under paragraph (2) with respect to the agreement; and

“(C) a certification that—

“(i) the agreement includes the appropriate terms, conditions, and duration of the agreement’s requirements with respect to Iran’s nuclear activities and provisions describing any sanctions to be waived, suspended, or otherwise reduced by the United States, and any other nation or entity, including the United Nations; and

“(ii) the President determines the agreement meets United States non-proliferation objectives, does not jeopardize the common defense and security, provides an adequate framework to ensure that Iran’s nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and ensures that Iran’s nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose.

“(2) VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall prepare, with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), a report assessing—

“(i) the extent to which the Secretary will be able to verify that Iran is complying with its obligations and commitments under the agreement;

“(ii) the adequacy of the safeguards and other control mechanisms and other assurances contained in the agreement with respect to Iran’s nuclear program to ensure Iran’s activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose; and

“(iii) the capacity and capability of the International Atomic Energy Agency to effectively implement the verification regime required by or related to the agreement, including whether the International Atomic Energy Agency will have sufficient access to investigate suspicious sites or allegations of covert nuclear-related activities and whether it has the required funding, manpower, and authority to undertake the verification regime required by or related to the agreement.

“(B) ASSUMPTIONS.—In preparing a report under subparagraph (A) with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assume that Iran could—

“(i) use all measures not expressly prohibited by the agreement to conceal activities that violate its obligations and commitments under the agreement; and

“(ii) alter or deviate from standard practices in order to impede efforts to verify that Iran is complying with those obligations and commitments.

“(C) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—A report under subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but shall include a classified annex prepared in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Neither the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1), nor subsections (b) through (g) of this section, shall apply to an agreement described in subsection (h)(5) or to the EU–Iran Joint Statement made on April 2, 2015.

“(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any agreement as defined in subsection (h)(1) and any related materials, whether concluded before or after the date of the enactment of this section, shall not be subject to the exception in subparagraph (A).

“(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 30 calendar day period following transmittal by the President of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a)—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold briefings and hearings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review such agreement;

“(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold briefings and hearings on the compliance and verification mechanisms of such agreement;

“(C) the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold briefings and hearings on the military significance of such agreement; and

“(D) the Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold briefings and hearings on the relief of sanctions provided under the agreement.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) shall be 60 calendar days if an agreement, including all materials required to be transmitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (a)(1), is trans-

mitted pursuant to subsection (a) between July 10, 2015, and September 7, 2015.

“(3) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING INITIAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), prior to and during the period for transmission of an agreement in subsection (a)(1) and during the period for congressional review provided in paragraph (1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).

“(4) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PRESIDENTIAL CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 12 calendar days following the date of passage of the joint resolution of disapproval.

“(5) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING CONGRESSIONAL RECONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (6), if a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c)(2)(B) passes the Congress, and the President vetoes such joint resolution, the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) for a period of 10 calendar days following the date of the President’s veto.

“(6) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under paragraphs (3) through (5) do not apply to any new deferral, waiver, or other suspension of statutory sanctions pursuant to the Joint Plan of Action if that deferral, waiver, or other suspension is made—

“(A) consistent with the law in effect on the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; and

“(B) not later than 45 calendar days before the transmission by the President of an agreement, assessment report, and certification under subsection (a).

“(7) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS BASED ON INSPECTIONS AND TRANSPARENCY.—The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and any other Executive branch officer or agency may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described under subsection (a) until the President makes the following certifications:

“(A) The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will have access anytime without notice to all of Iran’s nuclear facilities, including to Iran’s enrichment facility at Natanz and its former enrichment facility at Fordow, and all of Iran’s military facilities, and including the use of the most up-to-date, modern monitoring technologies.

“(B) Inspectors will have access to the supply chain that supports Iran’s nuclear program. The new transparency and inspections mechanisms will closely monitor materials and components to prevent diversion to a secret program.

“(C) Inspectors will have access to uranium mines and continuous surveillance at uranium mills, where Iran produces yellowcake, for 25 years.

“(D) Inspectors will have continuous surveillance of Iran’s centrifuge rotors and bellows production and storage facilities for 20 years, and Iran’s centrifuge manufacturing base will be frozen and under continuous surveillance.

“(E) All centrifuges and enrichment infrastructure removed from Fordow and Natanz will be placed under continuous monitoring by the IAEA.

“(F) As an additional transparency measure, a dedicated procurement channel for Iran’s nuclear program will be established to monitor and approve, on a case by case basis, the supply, sale, or transfer to Iran of certain nuclear-related and dual use materials and technology.

“(G) Iran has agreed to implement the Additional Protocol of the IAEA, providing the IAEA much greater access and information regarding Iran’s nuclear program, including both declared and undeclared facilities.

“(H) Iran will be required to grant access to the IAEA to investigate suspicious sites or allegations of a covert enrichment facility, conversion facility, centrifuge production facility, or yellowcake production facility anywhere in the country.

“(I) Iran has agreed to implement Modified Code 3.1 requiring early notification of construction of new facilities.

“(8) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS BASED ON THE POSSIBLE MILITARY DIMENSIONS OF IRAN’S NUCLEAR PROGRAM.—The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and any other Executive branch officer or agency may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described under subsection (a) until the President has certified to Congress that the Government of Iran has fully and verifiably disclosed all of Iran’s Possible Military Dimensions associated with the Iranian nuclear program.

“(9) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS BASED ON THE STATUS OF HARDENED UNDERGROUND ENRICHMENT FACILITIES.—The President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, and any other Executive branch officer or agency may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described under subsection (a) until the President has certified to Congress that the Government of Iran has permanently closed or rendered inoperable all of its hardened underground facilities associated with the Iranian nuclear program.

“(C) EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

“(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(A) the sanctions regime imposed on Iran by Congress is primarily responsible for bringing Iran to the table to negotiate on its nuclear program;

“(B) these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies;

“(C) this section does not require a vote by Congress for the agreement to commence;

“(D) this section provides for congressional review, including, as appropriate, for approval, disapproval, or no action on statutory sanctions relief under an agreement; and

“(E) even though the agreement may commence, because the sanctions regime was imposed by Congress and only Congress can permanently modify or eliminate that regime, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity, in an orderly and deliberative manner, to consider and, as appropriate, take action affecting the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

“(2) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to an agreement subject to subsection (a) or the Joint Plan of Action—

“(A) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does favor the agreement;

“(B) may not be taken if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the agreement; or

“(C) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, following the period for review provided in subsection (b), there is not enacted any such joint resolution.

“(3) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase ‘action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States’ shall include waiver, suspension, reduction, or other effort to provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to, Iran under any provision of law or any other effort to refrain from applying any such sanctions.

“(d) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF IRANIAN COMPLIANCE WITH NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of all aspects of Iranian compliance with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a).

“(2) POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT BREACHES AND COMPLIANCE INCIDENTS.—The President shall, within 10 calendar days of receiving credible and accurate information relating to a potentially significant breach or compliance incident by Iran with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a), submit such information to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

“(3) MATERIAL BREACH REPORT.—Not later than 30 calendar days after submitting information about a potentially significant breach or compliance incident pursuant to paragraph (2), the President shall make a determination whether such potentially significant breach or compliance issue constitutes a material breach and, if there is such a material breach, whether Iran has cured such material breach, and shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership such determination, accompanied by, as appropriate, a report on the action or failure to act by Iran that led to the material breach, actions necessary for Iran to cure the breach, and the status of Iran’s efforts to cure the breach.

“(4) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 calendar days after entering into an agreement described in subsection (a), and not less frequently than once every 180 calendar days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on Iran’s nuclear program and the compliance of Iran with the agreement during the period covered by the report, including the following elements:

“(A) Any action or failure to act by Iran that breached the agreement or is in non-compliance with the terms of the agreement.

“(B) Any delay by Iran of more than one week in providing inspectors access to facilities, people, and documents in Iran as required by the agreement.

“(C) Any progress made by Iran to resolve concerns by the International Atomic Energy Agency about possible military dimensions of Iran’s nuclear program.

“(D) Any procurement by Iran of materials in violation of the agreement or which could otherwise significantly advance Iran’s ability to obtain a nuclear weapon.

“(E) Any centrifuge research and development conducted by Iran that—

“(i) is not in compliance with the agreement; or

“(ii) may substantially enhance the breakout time of acquisition of a nuclear weapon by Iran, if deployed.

“(F) Any diversion by Iran of uranium, carbon-fiber, or other materials for use in Iran’s nuclear program in violation of the agreement.

“(G) Any covert nuclear activities undertaken by Iran, including any covert nuclear weapons-related or covert fissile material activities or research and development.

“(H) An assessment of whether any Iranian financial institutions are engaged in money laundering or terrorist finance activities, including names of specific financial institutions if applicable.

“(I) Iran’s advances in its ballistic missile program, including developments related to its long-range and inter-continental ballistic missile programs.

“(J) An assessment of—

“(i) whether Iran directly supported, financed, planned, or carried out an act of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

“(ii) whether, and the extent to which, Iran supported acts of terrorism, including acts of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world;

“(iii) all actions, including in international fora, being taken by the United States to stop, counter, and condemn acts by Iran to directly or indirectly carry out acts of terrorism against the United States and United States persons;

“(iv) the impact on the national security of the United States and the safety of United States citizens as a result of any Iranian actions reported under this paragraph; and

“(v) all of the sanctions relief provided to Iran, pursuant to the agreement, and a description of the relationship between each sanction waived, suspended, or deferred and Iran’s nuclear weapon’s program.

“(K) An assessment of whether violations of internationally recognized human rights in Iran have changed, increased, or decreased, as compared to the prior 180-day period.

“(5) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—

“(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Following submission of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense shall, upon the request of any of those committees or leadership, promptly furnish to those committees or leadership their views as to whether the safeguards and other controls contained in the agreement with respect to Iran’s nuclear program provide an adequate framework to ensure that Iran’s activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

“(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NUCLEAR INITIATIVES WITH IRAN.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees and leadership fully and currently informed of any initiative or negotiations with Iran relating to Iran’s nuclear program, including any new or amended agreement.

“(6) COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION.—After the review period provided in subsection (b), the President shall, not less than every 90 calendar days—

“(A) determine whether the President is able to certify that—

“(i) Iran is transparently, verifiably, and fully implementing the agreement, including all related technical or additional agreements;

“(ii) Iran has not committed a material breach with respect to the agreement or, if Iran has committed a material breach, Iran has cured the material breach;

“(iii) Iran has not taken any action, including covert action, that could significantly advance its nuclear weapons program; and

“(iv) suspension of sanctions related to Iran pursuant to the agreement is—

“(I) appropriate and proportionate to the specific and verifiable measures taken by Iran with respect to terminating its illicit nuclear program; and

“(II) vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

“(B) if the President determines he is able to make the certification described in subparagraph (A), make such certification to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

“(7) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(A) United States sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights abuses, and ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1);

“(B) issues not addressed by an agreement on the nuclear program of Iran, including fair and appropriate compensation for Americans who were terrorized and subjected to torture while held in captivity for 444 days after the seizure of the United States Embassy in Tehran, Iran, in 1979 and their families, the freedom of Americans held in Iran, the human rights abuses of the Government of Iran against its own people, and the continued support of terrorism worldwide by the Government of Iran, are matters critical to ensure justice and the national security of the United States, and should be expeditiously addressed;

“(C) the President should determine the agreement in no way compromises the commitment of the United States to Israel’s security, nor its support for Israel’s right to exist; and

“(D) in order to responsibly implement any long-term agreement reached between the P5+1 countries and Iran, it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity to review any agreement and, as necessary, take action to modify the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

“(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (d)(6) or has determined pursuant to subsection (d)(3) that Iran has materially breached an agreement subject to subsection (a) and the material breach has not been cured, Congress may initiate within 60 calendar days expedited consideration of qualifying legislation pursuant to this subsection.

“(2) QUALIFYING LEGISLATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualifying legislation’ means only a bill of either House of Congress—

“(A) the title of which is as follows: ‘A bill reinstating statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.’; and

“(B) the matter after the enacting clause of which is: ‘Any statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran pursuant to _____ that were waived, suspended, reduced, or otherwise relieved pursuant to an agreement submitted pursuant to section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 are hereby reinstated and any action by the United States Government to facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to such agreement, or provide any further waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief pursuant to such agreement is hereby prohibited.’, with the blank space being filled in with the law or laws under which sanctions are to be reinstated.

“(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the 60-calendar day period provided for in paragraph (1), qualifying legislation may be introduced—

“(A) in the House of Representatives, by the majority leader or the minority leader; and

“(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader’s designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader’s designee).

“(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House to which qualifying legislation has been referred has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration thereof.

“(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which qualifying legislation has been referred reports it to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the qualifying legislation in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the qualifying legislation with regard to the same agreement. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

“(C) CONSIDERATION.—The qualifying legislation shall be considered as read. All points of order against the qualifying legislation and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the qualifying legislation to final passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the qualifying legislation (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the qualifying legislation shall not be in order.

“(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

“(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—Qualifying legislation introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

“(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the Committee on Foreign Relations has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 session days after the date of referral of such legislation, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such legislation and the qualifying legislation shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

“(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the committee authorized to consider qualifying legislation reports it to the Senate or has been discharged from its con-

sideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of qualifying legislation, and all points of order against qualifying legislation (and against consideration of the qualifying legislation) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the qualifying legislation is agreed to, the qualifying legislation shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

“(D) DEBATE.—Debate on qualifying legislation, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the qualifying legislation is not in order.

“(E) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the qualifying legislation and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

“(F) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to qualifying legislation shall be decided without debate.

“(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to qualifying legislation, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such qualifying legislation, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

“(6) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of qualifying legislation of that House, that House receives qualifying legislation from the other House, then the following procedures shall apply:

“(i) The qualifying legislation of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

“(ii) With respect to qualifying legislation of the House receiving the legislation—

“(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no qualifying legislation had been received from the other House; but

“(II) the vote on passage shall be on the qualifying legislation of the other House.

“(B) TREATMENT OF A BILL OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce qualifying legislation under this section, the qualifying legislation of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

“(C) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the qualifying legislation in the Senate, the Senate then receives a companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

“(D) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to qualifying legislation which is a revenue measure.

“(f) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (e) is enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a

part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

“(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

“(g) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the section shall be construed as—

“(1) modifying, or having any other impact on, the President's authority to negotiate, enter into, or implement appropriate executive agreements, other than the restrictions on implementation of the agreements specifically covered by this section;

“(2) allowing any new waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief from statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law, or allowing the President to refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) during the period for review provided in subsection (b);

“(3) revoking or terminating any statutory sanctions imposed on Iran; or

“(4) authorizing the use of military force against Iran.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGREEMENT.—The term ‘agreement’ means an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees and leadership’ means the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Speaker, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

“(4) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Iranian financial institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

“(5) JOINT PLAN OF ACTION.—The term ‘Joint Plan of Action’ means the Joint Plan of Action, signed at Geneva November 24, 2013, by Iran and by France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Plan of Action, including the technical understandings reached on January 12, 2014, the extension thereto agreed to on July 18, 2014, the extension agreed to on November 24, 2014, and any materially identical extension that is agreed to on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015.

“(6) EU-IRAN JOINT STATEMENT.—The term ‘EU-Iran Joint Statement’ means only the Joint Statement by EU High Representative Federica Mogherini and Iranian Foreign Minister Javad Zarif made on April 2, 2015, at Lausanne, Switzerland.

“(7) MATERIAL BREACH.—The term ‘material breach’ means, with respect to an agreement described in subsection (a), any breach of the agreement, or in the case of non-binding commitments, any failure to perform those commitments, that substantially—

“(A) benefits Iran's nuclear program;

“(B) decreases the amount of time required by Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon; or

“(C) deviates from or undermines the purposes of such agreement.

“(8) NONCOMPLIANCE DEFINED.—The term ‘noncompliance’ means any departure from the terms of an agreement described in subsection (a) that is not a material breach.

“(9) P5+1 COUNTRIES.—The term ‘P5+1 countries’ means the United States, France, the Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and Germany.

“(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8511).”

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 2

SA 1198. Mr. COTTON (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1197 proposed by Mr. COTTON to the bill H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

On page 3, line 20, of the amendment, strike “purpose.” and insert the following: “purpose; and

“(iii) the President determines Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during

the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 30, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining Insurance Capital Rules and FSOC Process.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RAFAEL RAMOS AND WENJIAN LIU NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT OF 2015

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, S. 665.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 665) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 665) was passed, as follows:

S. 665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COORDINATOR.**—The term “Coordinator” means the Blue Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice designated under section 4(a).

(2) **BLUE ALERT.**—The term “Blue Alert” means information sent through the network relating to—

(A) the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer in the line of duty;

(B) an officer who is missing in connection with the officer’s official duties; or

(C) an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer.

(3) **BLUE ALERT PLAN.**—The term “Blue Alert plan” means the plan of a State, unit of local government, or Federal agency participating in the network for the dissemination of information received as a Blue Alert.

(4) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “law enforcement officer” shall have the same meaning as in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b).

(5) **NETWORK.**—The term “network” means the Blue Alert communications network established by the Attorney General under section 3.

(6) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 3. BLUE ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

The Attorney General shall establish a national Blue Alert communications network within the Department of Justice to issue Blue Alerts through the initiation, facilitation, and promotion of Blue Alert plans, in coordination with States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other appropriate entities.

SEC. 4. BLUE ALERT COORDINATOR; GUIDELINES.

(a) **COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.**—The Attorney General shall assign an existing officer of the Department of Justice to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert communications network.

(b) **DUTIES OF THE COORDINATOR.**—The Coordinator shall—

(1) provide assistance to States and units of local government that are using Blue Alert plans;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for States and units of local government to use in developing Blue Alert plans that will promote compatible and integrated Blue Alert plans throughout the United States, including—

(A) a list of the resources necessary to establish a Blue Alert plan;

(B) criteria for evaluating whether a situation warrants issuing a Blue Alert;

(C) guidelines to protect the privacy, dignity, independence, and autonomy of any law enforcement officer who may be the subject of a Blue Alert and the family of the law enforcement officer;

(D) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) the law enforcement agency involved—

(I) confirms—

(aa) the death or serious injury of the law enforcement officer; or

(bb) the attack on the law enforcement officer and that there is an indication of the death or serious injury of the officer; or

(II) concludes that the law enforcement officer is missing in connection with the officer’s official duties;

(ii) there is an indication of serious injury to or death of the law enforcement officer;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(E) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a threat to cause death or serious injury to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) a law enforcement agency involved confirms that the threat is imminent and credible;

(ii) at the time of receipt of the threat, the suspect is wanted by a law enforcement agency;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(F) guidelines—

(i) that information should be provided to the National Crime Information Center database operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and any relevant crime information repository of the State involved, relating to—

(I) a law enforcement officer who is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty; or

(II) an imminent and credible threat to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer;

(ii) that a Blue Alert should, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local governments), be limited to the geographic areas most likely to facilitate the apprehension of the suspect involved or which the suspect could reasonably reach, which should not be limited to State lines;

(iii) for law enforcement agencies of States or units of local government to develop plans to communicate information to neighboring States to provide for seamless communication of a Blue Alert; and

(iv) providing that a Blue Alert should be suspended when the suspect involved is apprehended or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective; and

(G) guidelines for—

(i) the issuance of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(ii) the extent of the dissemination of alerts issued through the network;

(3) develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects that address activities during the period beginning at the time of the initial notification of a law enforcement agency that a suspect has not been apprehended and ending at the time of apprehension of a suspect or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective, including protocols regulating—

(A) the use of public safety communications;

(B) command center operations; and

(C) incident review, evaluation, debriefing, and public information procedures;

(4) work with States to ensure appropriate regional coordination of various elements of the network;

(5) establish an advisory group to assist States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other entities involved in the network with initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alert plans, which shall include—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, representation from the various geographic regions of the United States; and

(B) members who are—

(i) representatives of a law enforcement organization representing rank-and-file officers;

(ii) representatives of other law enforcement agencies and public safety communications;

(iii) broadcasters, first responders, dispatchers, and radio station personnel; and

(iv) representatives of any other individuals or organizations that the Coordinator determines are necessary to the success of the network;

(6) act as the nationwide point of contact for—

(A) the development of the network; and

(B) regional coordination of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(7) determine—

(A) what procedures and practices are in use for notifying law enforcement and the public when—

(i) a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty;

(ii) a law enforcement officer is missing in connection with the officer’s official duties; and

(iii) an imminent and credible threat to kill or seriously injure a law enforcement officer is received; and

(B) which of the procedures and practices are effective and that do not require the expenditure of additional resources to implement.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.**—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2), protocols developed under subsection (b)(3), and other programs established under subsection (b), shall not be mandatory.

(2) **DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.**—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2) shall, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government), provide that appropriate information relating to a Blue Alert is disseminated to the appropriate officials of law enforcement agencies, public health agencies, and other agencies.

(3) **PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS.**—The guidelines established under subsection (b) shall—

(A) provide mechanisms that ensure that Blue Alerts comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations; and

(B) include standards that specifically provide for the protection of the civil liberties, including the privacy, of law enforcement officers who are seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer’s official duties, or who are threatened with death or serious injury, and the families of the officers.

(d) **COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.**—The Coordinator shall cooperate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and appropriate offices of the Department of

Justice in carrying out activities under this Act.

(e) **RESTRICTIONS ON COORDINATOR.**—The Coordinator may not—

(1) perform any official travel for the sole purpose of carrying out the duties of the Coordinator;

(2) lobby any officer of a State regarding the funding or implementation of a Blue Alert plan; or

(3) host a conference focused solely on the Blue Alert program that requires the expenditure of Federal funds.

(f) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Coordinator and the effectiveness and status of the Blue Alert plans that are in effect or being developed.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 1, 2015, AS “SILVER STAR SERVICE BANNER DAY”

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 136) expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2015, as “Silver Star Service Banner Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 136) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 16, 2015, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 158, Cinco de Mayo; S. Res. 159, National 9–1–1 Education Month; S. Res. 160, Public Service Recognition Week; S. Res. 161, Financial Literacy Month; S. Res. 162, Alcohol Responsibility Month; S. Res. 163, earthquake in Nepal; S. Res. 164, Dia de los Ninos; and S. Res. 165, World Malaria Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 84 through 94, and 96 through 106, and all nominations placed on the Secretary’s desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army Medical Service Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 3064:

To be brigadier general

Col. Raymond S. Dingle

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Ron. J. MacLaren

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Herman A. Shelanski

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Joseph Anderson

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. James J. Burks

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. James C. Balserak
Brig. Gen. Steven J. Berryhill
Brig. Gen. Kevin W. Bradley
Brig. Gen. Peter J. Byrne
Brig. Gen. Gretchen S. Dunkelberger
Brig. Gen. Richard J. Evans, III
Brig. Gen. Robert M. Ginnetti
Brig. Gen. Jeffrey W. Hauser
Brig. Gen. William O. Hill
Brig. Gen. Joseph K. Kim
Brig. Gen. Jerome P. Limoge, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Paul C. Maas, Jr.
Brig. Gen. John P. McGoff
Brig. Gen. Brian C. Newby
Brig. Gen. Marc H. Sasseville
Brig. Gen. Michael E. Stencel
Brig. Gen. Carol A. Timmons

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Kyle W. Robinson

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Robert D. Carlson
Brig. Gen. Daniel J. Dire
Brig. Gen. Mary E. Link
Brig. Gen. Hugh C. Van Roosen

To be brigadier general

Col. Vincent B. Barker
Col. Lisa L. Doumont
Col. Robert D. Harter
Col. John F. Hussey
Col. Scott R. Morcomb
Col. Gerard L. Schwartz
Col. Richard K. Sele
Col. Tracy L. Smith

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army as a Chaplain under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 3064:

To be brigadier general

Chaplain (Col.) Thomas L. Solhjem

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Danelle M. Barrett

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Ronald C. Copley

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Timothy M. Ray

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Darryl L. Roberson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr.

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Eric C. Bush

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Alan R. Lynn

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Jill K. Faris

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Gary H. Cheek

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Christian A. Rofrano

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Nora W. Tyson

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Mark A. Brilakis

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10 U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Robert S. Walsh

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN355 AIR FORCE nomination of Troy S. Thomas, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN356 AIR FORCE nomination of Linell A. Letendre, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN386 AIR FORCE nominations (115) beginning BAMIDELE A. ADETUNJI, and ending KERI L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN387 AIR FORCE nominations (20) beginning TRAVIS M. ALLEN, and ending JEREMY JAMES WELLS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN388 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning RICHARD S. BEYEA, III, and ending TRAVIS C. YELTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN389 AIR FORCE nominations (9) beginning KEITH L. CLARK, and ending JENNIE LEIGH L. STODDART, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN390 AIR FORCE nominations (54) beginning TALIB Y. ALI, and ending GABRIEL ZIMMERER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN391 AIR FORCE nomination of John W. Heck, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN392 AIR FORCE nomination of Anna Hamm, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN393 AIR FORCE nomination of Jermal M. Scarbrough, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN394 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning CYNTHIA A. RUTHERFORD, and ending ANGELA SCEVOLA-DATTOLI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN395 AIR FORCE nomination of Susan I. Pangelinan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

IN THE ARMY

PN25 ARMY nomination of Bryan K. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 7, 2015.

PN252 ARMY nomination of Mark A. Endsley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2015.

PN319 ARMY nominations (3) beginning ARPANA JAIN, and ending RAMA KRISHNA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 25, 2015.

PN357 ARMY nomination of James J. Raftery, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN358 ARMY nomination of David A. Harper, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN359 ARMY nominations (2) beginning STEVEN R. ANSLEY, JR., and ending KAREN S. HANSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN396 ARMY nomination of Rita A. Kostecke, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN397 ARMY nominations (2) beginning SCHAWN B. BRANCH, and ending FRANK A.

SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN77 MARINE CORPS nomination of Joshua B. Roberts, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN125 MARINE CORPS nominations (69) beginning DAWN R. ALONSO, and ending VINCENT J. YASAKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN320 NAVY nominations (2) beginning NAWAZ K. A. HACK, and ending ROBERT P. RUTTER, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 25, 2015.

PN360 NAVY nomination of Brian L. Tichenor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN361 NAVY nomination of Cheryl Gotzinger, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 13, 2015.

PN398 NAVY nomination of John P. O'Brien, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN404 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CAROLYN A. WINNINGHAM, and ending SARA M. BUSTAMANTE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 4, 2015

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, Senators should expect a vote in relation to the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8 at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MAY 4, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 4, 2015, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

PATRICIA NELSON LIMERICK, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018, VICE ROBERT S. MARTIN, TERM EXPIRED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

GAYLE SMITH, OF OHIO, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE RAJIV J. SHAH, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

JULIE HELENE BECKER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE HERBERT BLALOCK DIXON, JR., RETIRED.

STEVEN M. WELLNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE KAYE K. CHRISTIAN, RETIRED.

WILLIAM WARD NOOTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE A. FRANKLIN BURGESS, RETIRED.

ROBERT A. SALERNO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE ROBERT ISAAC RICHTER, RETIRED.

TODD SUNHWAE KIM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE KATHRYN A. OBERLY, RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSHUA D. BURGESS
JAMES R. CANTU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL I. ETAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ERIK D. MASICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

MUHAMMAD R. KHAWAJA
MUHAMMAD S. MUNIR
NIKALESH REDDY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

RICHARD A. BRAUNBECK III
KENNETH J. BROWN, JR.
GRANT GORTON
ANTHONY K. JARAMILLO
WESLEY J. JOSHWAY
MICHAEL H. MCCURDY
JEFFREY J. PRONESTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

THURRAYA S. KENT
JASON P. SALATA
WENDY L. SNYDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL E. BIERY
DANIEL C. HEDRICK
JAMES A. MCMULLIN III
TONY S. W. PARK
MATTHEW D. TURNER
RICKY M. URSERY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

NEIL T. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER J. STERBIS

WENDY A. TOWLE
DOMINICK A. VINCENT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JASON B. BABCOCK
JAMES L. CAROLAND
PATRICK A. COUNT
JOEL D. DAVIS
JOSEPH E. DUPRE
CLARENCE FRANKLIN, JR.
KURTIS A. MOLE
DANNY L. NOLES
DONOVAN I. OUBRE
CESAR G. RIOS, JR.
CHRISTOPHER P. SLATTERY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

NICHOLAS E. ANDREWS
RODNEY J. BURLEY
JOAQUIN S. CORREA
GEORGE D. DAVIS III
ANDREW D. GAINER
JAMES B. GATEAU
JODY H. GRADY
BOBBY L. HAND, JR.
DAMEN O. HOFHEINZ
EDWARD A. KRUK
SHAWN A. ROBERTS
VINCENT S. TIONQUIAO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

SOWON S. AHN
ANDREW N. COREY
ROBERT F. HIGHT, JR.
JEFFREY J. JAKUBOSKI
SEAN R. KENTCH
MADELENE E. MEANS
JAMES F. SCARCELLI
BENJAMIN A. SNELL
HENRY A. STEPHENSON
SCOTT R. WHALEY
CRAIG M. WHITTINGHILL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

STEVEN W. CONNELL
JON C. GRANT
JACKIE D. KNICK
ROSARIO D. MCWHORTER
JAMES D. RHOADS
DANIEL M. ROSSLER
JAMES P. TURNER
MICHAEL A. WHITT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

ANTHONY S. ARDITO
RYAN L. BIRKELBACH
ROBERT E. BREISCH III
JOSHUA L. BROADBENT
DANIEL F. BURBA
ADAM R. CAMPBELL
RICHARD E. CAMPBELL, JR.
TIMOTHY B. CLARK
KEENAN L. COLEMAN
JEFFREY A. CORNIELLE
GRAIG T. DIEFENDERFER
CHASE H. DILLARD
LEWIS R. EMERY
MATTHEW R. FURTADO
DANIEL E. GARDNER
SEAN A. GENIS
SEAN F. GLASS
JASON A. GOELLER
BRANDON C. HARDIN
ERIC E. HAYES
EVAN E. HENTSCHEL
RYAN P. HILGER
MICHAEL C. HUGHES
ROBERT B. INMAN
MASON P. JONES
JAMES M. KAUFMAN
ROBERT E. KELLER
JOSEPH J. KIMOCK, JR.
JEFFREY R. KINGSLAND
SAMUEL G. LEHNER
CHRISTOPHER A. LINDAHL
BENJAMIN S. MACNEIL
TYLER V. MARSHBURN
JASON L. MCKEOWN
DAVID P. MOSES
WILLIAM P. MURPHY
JUSTIN M. NEFF
DAVID D. NOVOTNEY
FELIX PEREZ
TRAVIS L. RAINEY
CHRISTOPHER J. ROGERS
MATTHEW G. SHIPMAN
DAVID A. SMITH

PHILIP S. SMITH
TIMOTHY S. SMITH
JAMES A. STANKE
DAMON Y. TURNER
JEREMY W. WHEELIS
MARVIN L. WILSON
RODERICK D. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CHRISTINE J. CASTON
MELANIE R. N. HAO
JOHN D. HUDSON
ELENA P. INGRAM
PATRICK S. MARTIN
STEVEN M. MILINKOVICH
KATHERINE J. SCHULLIAN
KAREN L. SRAV
JAMES V. WALSH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL A. HURNI
PAUL J. LING III
JAMES C. RENTFROW
DAVID M. RUTH
ELIZABETH R. SANABIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROBERT C. BANDY
ROBERT E. BEBERMEYER
VINCENT S. CHERNESKY
KENNETH A. EBERT
JONATHAN C. GARCIA
DAVID T. HART
PETER A. LASHOMB
ELIZABETH S. OKANO
CAREY M. PANTLING
FRANCIS D. ROCHFORD
RONALD J. RUTAN
STEPHEN F. SARAR
DJUENO S. SEARLES
NEIL G. SEXTON
KENNETH S. SHEPARD
PETER D. SMALL
GODFREY D. WEEKES
DOUGLAS L. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DOMINIC S. CARONELLO
JEFFREY J. CARTY
JOSEPH A. CASCIO
DANIEL P. COVELLI
MATTHEW W. EDWARDS
THOMAS H. HOOVER
DANIEL L. MACKIN
RICHARD M. MASICA
PAUL J. MITCHELL
VERNON J. RED
KERRY D. SMITH
MICHAEL J. SUPKO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

GARRETT T. PANKOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

WILLIAM M. WALKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER C. MEYER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

JEFFREY G. BENTSON
PAUL N. PORENSKY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

KEVIN D. CLARIDA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRIANNA E. JACKSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JARED M. SPILKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

FRANCINE SEGOVIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

TODD W. MALLORY

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 2015:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

COL. RAYMOND S. DINGLE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RON. J. MACLAREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. HERMAN A. SHELANSKI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOSEPH ANDERSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES J. BURKS

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES C. BALSERAK
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN J. BERRYHILL
BRIG. GEN. KEVIN W. BRADLEY
BRIG. GEN. PETER J. BYRNE
BRIG. GEN. GRETCHEN S. DUNKELBERGER
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD J. EVANS III
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT M. GINETTI
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY W. HAUSER
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM O. HILL
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH K. KIM
BRIG. GEN. JEROME P. LIMOGES, JR.
BRIG. GEN. PAUL C. MAAS, JR.
BRIG. GEN. JOHN P. MCGOFF
BRIG. GEN. BRIAN C. NEWBY
BRIG. GEN. MARC H. SASSEVILLE
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL E. STENCEL
BRIG. GEN. CAROL A. TIMMONS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. KYLE W. ROBINSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT D. CARLSON
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL J. DIRE
BRIG. GEN. MARY E. LINK
BRIG. GEN. HUGH C. VAN ROOSEN

To be brigadier general

COL. VINCENT B. BARKER

COL. LISA L. DOUMONT
COL. ROBERT D. HARTER
COL. JOHN F. HUSSEY
COL. SCOTT R. MORCOMB
COL. GERARD L. SCHWARTZ
COL. RICHARD K. SELE
COL. TRACY L. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be brigadier general

CHAPLAIN (COL.) THOMAS L. SOLHJEM

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DANIEL M. BARRETT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RONALD C. COPELY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. TIMOTHY M. RAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DARRYL L. ROBERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES Q. BROWN, JR.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ERIC C. BUSH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ALAN R. LYNN

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JILL K. FARIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GARY H. CHEEK

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTIAN A. ROPRANO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. NORA W. TYSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPOR-

TANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MARK A. BRILAKIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT S. WALSH

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF TROY S. THOMAS, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LINELL A. LETENDRE, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BAMIDELE A. ADETUNJI AND ENDING WITH KERI L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TRAVIS M. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH JEROME JAMES WELLS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD S. BEYEA III AND ENDING WITH TRAVIS C. YELTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEITH L. CLARK AND ENDING WITH JENNIE LEIGH L. STODDART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TALIB Y. ALI AND ENDING WITH GABRIEL ZIMMERER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOHN W. HECK, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ANNA HAMM, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JERMAL M. SCARBROUGH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CYNTHIA A. RUTHERFORD AND ENDING WITH ANGELA SCEVOLADATTOLI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF SUSAN I. PANGELINAN, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRYAN K. ANDERSON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARK A. ENDSLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARPANA JAIN AND ENDING WITH RAMA KRISHNA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 25, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMES J. RAFTERY, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID A. HARPER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN R. ANSLEY, JR. AND ENDING WITH KAREN S. HANSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 13, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RITA A. KOSTECKE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCHAWN B. BRANCH AND ENDING WITH FRANK A. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JOSHUA B. ROBERTS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAWN R. ALONSO AND ENDING WITH VINCENT J. YASAKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NAWAZ K. A. HACK AND ENDING WITH ROBERT P. RUTTER, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 25, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRIAN L. TICHENOR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHERYL GOTZINGER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOHN P. O'BRIEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CAROLYN A. WINNINGHAM AND ENDING WITH SARA M. BUSTAMANTE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXTENDING CONGRATULATIONS TO JOYCE GARVER KELLER

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize my friend, Ms. Joyce Garver Keller, on her retirement.

For 25 years, Joyce has stood as a faithful advocate and a strong voice for justice. As the Executive Director of Ohio Jewish Communities, she has led the way in providing elected officials guidance on the most important issues impacting the Jewish organizations and congregations in Ohio and across the country.

I am glad to call Joyce my friend and I am glad she was one of the many in attendance of what she described as “an extraordinary moment in history,” during Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s address to Congress this year.

Joyce, thank you for all your work. You will be missed in the halls of the Congress but your drive and unwavering dedication will have a lasting impact that will continue to resonate here and in Ohio. I wish you the very best as you begin your next chapter.

On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I proudly recognize Ms. Joyce Garver Keller for 25 years of service with the Ohio Jewish Communities.

HONORING THE BARTELS FAMILY FOR THEIR OUTSTANDING COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION AND THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAVEN

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join the University of New Haven’s (UNH) Board of Governors and its President, Dr. Steven Kaplan, in recognizing the Bartels family for its unrelenting commitment to the University and its students through generous support of scholarships and academic programs.

I am honored to be a part of recognizing this tremendous family and formalizing this special recognition in memory of Henry E. “Hank” Bartels. Over the past forty years, Hank and Nancy Bartels, along with their son Philip, and his wife, Susan, have contributed immeasurably to UNH’s development, supporting its mission of providing high quality experiential education, through a combination of liberal arts and real-world, hands-on professional training. In the words of President Kaplan, “The Bartels family has established an indelible legacy at this institution and has touched the lives of countless students.” The Bartels continue this tradition by dem-

onstrating an unwavering appreciation for UNH, its potential, and the promise it delivers to innumerable students.

There is no greater tribute to Hank Bartels and that of the entire Bartels family than its most recent work in commissioning UNH’s inaugural Washington Program. The initial launch of the program last fall consisted of a team of 19 students participating in the 2014 Annual Model United Nation Conference. They were Aemin Becker, Matthew Belletete, Connor Briggs, Juliana Calcagno, Rob Granoth, Jamie Harron, James Hart, Elise Lenahan, Sarah Markland, Amanda Nash, Emily Nash, Samanth Paquette, Melissa Peil, Paul Raffile, Bobby Rousseau, Jessica Sattler, Emil Thomsen, Randi Trinidad, and Connor Vargo. In preparation for the competition, students were exposed to high-level briefings by international stakeholders based in Washington, DC and Federal officials integral to the operation of the UN and its missions. As a result of the intense preparation and high-caliber exposure to UN stakeholders, the UNH delegation won the Distinguished Delegation Award, an honor bestowed to only 14 colleges and universities out of the more than 100 from the U.S. and abroad that participated.

The next installment of UNH’s Washington Program consisted of a semester course entitled, American Rome: Washington DC—Power, Politics, Policy. This course exposed students to the structure and culture of the U.S. Federal government as it relates to the national security system. The course culminated in a week in Washington where students met with current and former officials from the Executive Branch, Federal Agencies, and Congress, as well as academia. During this week, 15 UNH students visited the White House, Pentagon, Capitol Hill, Federal Bureau of Investigations, Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency and U.S. Naval Academy. Students included Naif Alharbi, Britany Codiana, Lindsey Conley, Zachery Fiermonti, Michael Hagen, Sarah Hoffman, Ryan Lebel, Sebika Mazumdar, Paul Raffile, Richard Rotella, Elizabeth Rowan, Jonathan Trinh, Andrew Wallis, Walter Williams, and Cassidy Yotnakparian. In the words of one participating student, “This is my first Political Science/National Security class here at UNH, and it has truly changed my perspective on my future career; the trip made me want to join the Navy then work in Washington after a military career.” Each student indicated the visit to Washington heightened interests to serve our country as military officials, civil servants or another capacity to enhance the country’s national security interests.

As a result of the Bartels family’s incredible generosity, these students were able to travel to Washington and engage in a transformational experience that will undoubtedly help shape the careers and lives of our country’s next generation of leaders. I am proud to join the students, faculty and university administration—particularly Dr. Steven Kaplan, President, Dr. Daniel May, Provost, Dr. Lourdes Alvarez, Dean of College of Arts &

Sciences, Dr. Mario Gaboury, Dean Henry C. Lee College of Criminal Justice and Forensic Sciences, Dr. Chris Haynes, Assistant Professor and Political Science Coordinator, Dr. Matthew Schmidt, Assistant Professor of National Security and Political Science, Dr. Patricia Crouse, Practitioner in Residence, Department of Political Science, and Dr. Christy Smith, Assistant Professor of Public Administration—in expressing the deepest gratitude to the Bartels family for providing these young men and women with a solid foundation and instilling a sense of purpose and service to our great nation.

HONORING MR. BILL RUFTY

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I first met Bill Ruffy nearly 30 years, when I was serving in the Florida House of Representatives. Our paths crossed often when I was Speaker of the House in Florida, and Bill always had an ear out for Polk County. Throughout his career, Bill has been a steady reporter who stuck to the facts, reporting information just as he saw it. In that way, Bill was old school, a dying breed of journalist.

A few years ago, Bill was the first reporter to interview me when I began representing Polk County in Congress and opened an office inside the Winter Haven City Hall. Measured and accurate, Bill has been a friend and familiar face while covering both state and federal issues. It has been a pleasure to work with him for three decades in serving the best interests of Central Florida. I wish him the best.

COMMEMORATING THE 85TH ANNI- VERSARY OF THE GIFT OF ME- MORIAL CITY HALL

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 85th anniversary of the gift of Memorial City Hall in the City of Auburn, New York. In 1929, Memorial City Hall was built in the City of Auburn in memory of David Munson Osborne, Mayor of the City of Auburn from 1879–1880. Memorial City Hall continues to serve as the center of civic activity in Auburn, a memorial to the City’s rich history, and an architectural classic.

Memorial City Hall was commissioned by daughters of David Munson Osborne and sisters of Mayor Thomas Mott Osborne, Helen Osborne Storrow and Emily Osborne Harris. The Hall was designed by the acclaimed architecture firm, Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch, and Abbott. Memorial City Hall’s grand portico,

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

pediment, and ionic columns stand as a monumental example of Colonial Revival architecture in 19th and 20th century America.

The history and strength of the City of Auburn is reflected in Memorial City Hall. I am pleased to share in the 85th anniversary of this landmark which continues to serve the residents of Auburn and memorialize the public service of David Munson Osborne and the entire Osborne family.

TRIBUTE TO THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, last week, with great fanfare and enthusiasm, the Bike Away the Atomic Bomb ride set off from in front of the Capitol. That project, coordinated by Kazakhstan's ATOM Project along with Bike for Peace and Mayors for Peace, sent riders from DC to New York to call for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty at the UN Non-proliferation Treaty Review Conference that began April 27. They were seen off by the ATOM project's Honorary Ambassador, the artist and painter Karipbek Kuyukov, who was born—without arms—roughly 60 miles from the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site in eastern Kazakhstan. It was the beginning of a 200-mile ride, but also a leg in a long, admirable journey Kazakhstan has taken since its independence.

In an increasingly dangerous world, the Republic of Kazakhstan has taken the lead in eliminating nuclear weapons while supporting the safe, secure, and peaceful use of nuclear energy. When the Soviet Union collapsed in December 1991, a newly-independent Kazakhstan inherited 1,410 nuclear warheads as well as the Semipalatinsk nuclear weapon test site. By 1995—just four short years later—the young country had destroyed or removed all their nuclear weapons and joined the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear weapons state; by the year 2000, it had destroyed its nuclear testing infrastructure at Semipalatinsk.

Kazakhstan is one of only a handful of countries that has taken these dramatic steps to make the world safer. Of those few, it is in a unique position to understand the devastating effects of nuclear weapons. For forty years, Kazakhstan was a test site for nuclear weapons. The fall-out from these hundreds of tests, including over 100 above ground, has left the Kazakh people with a terrible legacy of untimely deaths and birth defects that continue to this day. As Americans, we are lucky to only be able to grasp the threat of nuclear weapons abstractly and intellectually; for the Kazakhs that threat has been all too real.

In response to this terrible historical burden, Kazakhstan has taken the lead promoting nuclear non-proliferation. It has promoted a Central Asian Nuclear Weapons Free Zone and is now leading a global movement against nuclear weapons testing while offering to host the world's first "nuclear fuel bank" in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency. It has worked to keep Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, and hosted the P5+1 talks in Almaty. And while taking advantage of

its natural and technological resources to develop civilian nuclear power as an additional energy source, for both itself and other countries, Kazakhstan sought to make civilian nuclear power production more safe and secure by agreeing to adopt the Nuclear Security Guidelines at 2014 Nuclear Security Summit.

Members, myself included, regularly take to the floor to call attention to the problems in another country. Whether we censure other nations for their belligerence, condemn them for their treatment of their own populations, or express concern over their challenges in the face of internal crises, we too often speak out on the depressing news that somewhere in the world, something has gone terribly wrong. It gives me enormous pleasure, as a co-chair of the House's Nuclear Security Working Group, to call our attention today to a nation where something that has gone very, very right, and to commend the Republic of Kazakhstan for the role it continues to play in creating a safer, more secure future for itself and for the globe.

CELEBRATING MAYOR KEITH CAIN

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Keith Cain, City of Princeton Mayor, and to recognize his years of dedication and honorable service to the city of Princeton, Bureau County, and the State of Illinois.

Mayor Cain served as Princeton's Mayor since 1999—ushering in a new City Manager Form of government, leading to more efficiency and economic development. Mayor Cain's leadership in transforming a Brownfield site into Festival 56—the largest professional theater festival in the State of Illinois—has been instrumental in strengthening city tourism and retail development.

These are just a couple examples of how Mayor Cain has guided the city to new heights and was a constant comforting presence to the residents he so honorably served.

Though Mr. Cain is retiring from the position of Mayor—I know he will continue to serve his community and be a constant presence and a trusted confidant to those seeking his advice. Mr. Cain has been an invaluable source of information to my office on the issues facing the residents of Princeton and the City as a whole.

While Mr. Cain is retiring from his post, I know he will continue to work and serve the community that he loves so much and will always lend a helping hand when needed. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our deepest thanks to Keith Cain for his commendable service and dedication.

CELEBRATING MRS. TRELLIE
ELIZABETH HARTMAN'S 97TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate a truly remarkable woman who is celebrating her 97th birthday, Mrs. Trellie Elizabeth Hartman. It is with great enthusiasm that I join her family and friends in celebrating this milestone and her many lifetime achievements that exemplify her Hoosier values.

A native of Argos, Indiana, she worked on her family's farm where she gained a strong work ethic at a young age. Trellie took her work ethic and Hoosier values to Contra Costa College in California, where she earned a degree in nursing. For more than 35 years, she worked as a nurse and cared for others in need. Since her retirement, she has stayed involved in her community by volunteering for Kaiser Hospital, oftentimes working double shifts.

Mrs. Hartman has been blessed with three children, nine grandchildren, 16 great grandchildren, and five great-great grandchildren. Although Trellie no longer lives in Indiana, she exemplifies what it means to be a Hoosier and continues to act as a strong role model for future generations.

I want to sincerely thank Trellie for her service and recognize her unwavering commitment to the healthcare field. It is my honor to offer my sincere congratulations to Mrs. Hartman on this special occasion. I wish her a very happy birthday and many more years of continued health and happiness.

HONORING JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Jay College of Criminal Justice in my district in New York City, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

Located steps from Lincoln Center in the cultural heart of New York City, John Jay College is one of the nation's leading liberal arts institutions of higher education with a mission of educating for justice. This theme is at the core of each of its programs across arts, sciences, and humanities. An international leader in educating for justice, John Jay offers a rich liberal arts and professional studies curriculum to upwards of 15,000 undergraduate and graduate students from more than 135 nations, including over 47% first generation students and more than 500 veterans. John Jay College is ranked #3 in the nation as a "Best for Vet" institution by Military Times in its 2015 national college rankings of 600 universities and colleges.

The original catalyst for the school came from increasing concerns among civic leaders in New York over ongoing relations between the police and the community and the increasing complexity of police work. A small and

dedicated group of academic visionaries came together to develop a plan for a new college named the College of Police Science within the City University of New York. Within a year, the college was renamed the John Jay College of Criminal Justice to reflect broader aspirations and achievements in criminal justice, leadership, and public service. John Jay, of course, was the first Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court and served as governor of our New York.

The challenges and hard work envisioned when John Jay College was created continue today. John Jay College is a critical part of our community. The essence of John Jay College of Criminal Justice can be found in its students, Pulitzer Prize-winning faculty, and enthusiastic administrators who form a civic-minded community of motivated and intellectually curious individuals committed to public service and global citizenship.

The accolades are many:

Just a few weeks ago, the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations (NECO) established a scholarship at John Jay College in memory of New York City Police Department Detectives Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu who lost their lives in December 2014 while serving the citizens of New York. The scholarship was announced on March 11 during the college's NYPD alumni reception held in celebration of the longstanding partnership and collaboration with the NYPD.

The National Network for Safe Communities at John Jay College, led by Professor David Kennedy, supports strategic interventions to reduce violence and community disorder. These strategies combine the best of law enforcement and community-driven approaches to improve public safety, minimize arrests and incarceration, enhance police legitimacy, and rebuild relationships between law enforcement and distressed communities. Attorney General Holder just announced six host pilot sites in Birmingham, AL; Fort Worth, TX; Gary, IN; Minneapolis, MN; Pittsburgh, PA; and Stockton, CA for the National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice, a three-year multi-million dollar project under the leadership of the National Network and John Jay. As part of a larger effort, each pilot site will assess the police-community relationship and develop a detailed site-specific plan that will enhance procedural justice, reduce bias, and support reconciliation in communities where trust has been harmed.

John Jay College was called on to provide expert advice and testimony to President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, including expert testimony from President Jeremy Travis, Professor Delores Jones-Brown and Professor David Kennedy.

September 11, 2001 had a profound impact on the campus and served as a catalyst to honor the 67 students, faculty and alumni that lost their lives that day. John Jay established a variety of initiatives, programs, research centers, and scholarships including the creation of the Center on Terrorism to study global terrorism and the Christian Regenhart Center for Emergency Response Studies, named after a probationary firefighter killed at the World Trade Center. As one of the leading institutions in the country in the field of criminal justice and public safety, John Jay College is one of the few institutions to offer M.A. students a certificate in the critical study of terrorism.

John Jay College's commitment to diversity is shown by the fact that it has the highest Hispanic enrollment of any four year college in the northeastern United States, and it has ranked #1 in the nation in awarding bachelor's degrees in protective services, #3 in psychology degrees, and #7 in public administration. John Jay's undergraduate, graduate and doctoral forensic degree programs are tops in the country. The College's Master of Public Administration programs recently received the Diversity and Social Equity Awards by the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs and Administration. The nationally-recognized Program for Research Initiatives in Science and Math (PRISM) at John Jay College engages underrepresented students in careers in science and math by providing an opportunity for them to participate in faculty-mentored scientific research in areas like molecular biology, toxicology, criminalistics and computer science, and partake in professional research conferences while completing their degree. Since its inception, graduation numbers from the College's science majors have tripled, and the number of students, and especially underrepresented minority students, moving on to doctoral and medical degrees has grown fivefold.

John Jay's faculty personify excellence—they include Pulitzer Prize winners, Presidential scholars, recipients of prestigious book awards, presidents of leading professional organizations and editors of prominent scholarly journals. They have been recognized by their peers, and even by the White House, for their dedication to teaching, research and mentoring. The College's students regularly win prestigious scholarships, including the Marshall Scholarship, internships, including the White House Internship, and fellowships, including Fulbright, JK Watson and the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship. They are also accepted to high-profile graduate and professional schools. Their alumni number more than 54,000, many of whom hold leadership roles in public sector agencies, including the United States Marshals Service, the FBI, the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the National Parks Service, the State Department, Peace Corps, the United Nations, and private companies in the U.S. and worldwide.

Affordability is an essential component of the College's core mission. At a time when over 37 million Americans are saddled with over \$1 trillion in student debt, John Jay College recently was named one of the top ten colleges where students graduate with the least debt. Only 20% of John Jay students were compelled to borrow money to finance their college education, less than one third of the national average. And the vast majority of John Jay students graduate debt-free—enabling them to become successful in service for others without having to spend years paying off their student loans. In fact John Jay College was recently ranked #4 in the "Best Bang for the Buck" in the northeast rankings in Washington Monthly's College guide.

John Jay develops fierce advocates for justice—each committed every day to building a better democracy. I am proud to represent John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the values that it stands for and works for every day. Congratulations to John Jay College on this very important day and its 50 year record of fighting for justice.

IN RECOGNITION OF REVEREND JOHN S. TERRY FOR HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORDINATION INTO THE PRIESTHOOD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Father John S. Terry, who will be celebrating his 40 years of service to the Priesthood on Saturday, May 2. Born in Scranton, Pennsylvania, Father Terry heard his calling to the priesthood while attending St. Michael's Grade School and Scranton Preparatory School.

Father Terry began his religious studies at the University of Scranton. After two years, he continued his formation at St. Pius X Seminary. He further continued his studies at Our Lady of Angels Theological Seminary in Albany, NY before transferring to Christ the King Seminary in Olean, NY. In May 1974, he was ordained a deacon and assigned to a small community in Ellicottville, NY. His next assignment was to the Diocese of Buffalo Seminary at East Aurora, NY. The next year, he was assigned to his home Diocese, and he served as a Deacon to St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception in Wilkes-Barre.

On May 2, 1975, Father Terry was inducted into the priesthood and assigned to St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception. In 1979, Father Terry was appointed Assistant Pastor at St. Patrick's, and he was also made Director of the Catholic Youth Center, where he still serves today.

In 1982, Father Terry was assigned to Holy Savior Church and St. Christopher's Church, where he spent eight years. In December of 1990, Father Terry was temporarily stationed at the Catholic Community in Sugar Notch, and, in 1992, he was named Pastor of all three Sugar Notch churches—St. Peter and Paul, St. Charles Borromeo, and Holy Family.

On July 6, 2004, Father Terry became Pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Maternity. The consolidations of St. Joseph's Church of Wilkes-Barre Township and Holy Trinity of Wilkes-Barre with St. Mary's of the Maternity formed the new parish of Our Lady of Hope, where Father Terry serves today as its first Pastor.

It is an honor to recognize Father John S. Terry on his 40th Anniversary. I am grateful for his many stations and years of service to Wilkes-Barre and the surrounding area. May he continue to serve his civic community, the priesthood, and his faith community with continued, inspirational dedication.

CELEBRATING MRS. NELLIE ESTHER HUNTER'S 97TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate a fellow Hoosier who is celebrating her 97th birthday, Mrs. Nellie Esther Hunter. Mrs. Hunter is a truly remarkable woman who embodies Hoosier values to the fullest. A native of Argos, Indiana she attended the one-room Santa Ana School

House. Like many Hoosiers, she worked on her family's farm where she learned a strong work ethic, something she has utilized throughout her life. She has been blessed with three children, four grandchildren and one great grandchild. At the age of 81, she earned her General Education Development degree and was awarded "Adult Student of the Year" by the State of Indiana. A woman deeply committed to the community around her, she continued to serve others by working as a tutor at a local private school until last year and volunteered at the local food pantry.

I want to sincerely thank Mrs. Hunter for her service and recognize her unwavering commitment to her community. It is my honor to offer my congratulations to Mrs. Hunter on this special occasion. I wish her a very happy birthday and many more years of continued health and happiness.

HONORING THE MICHAEL BAKER CORPORATION'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Michael Baker Corporation, an engineering firm which is celebrating its 75th Anniversary on May 1.

Founded in 1940 in Rochester, Pennsylvania, the firm's success began with a focus on surveying and civil engineering. Since that time, Baker has added a host of differentiated services including communications, planning, architecture, and environmental consulting to assist its clients' projects. The Michael Baker Corporation has grown to employ more than 5,000 employees in over 90 offices worldwide.

Baker has a storied history of completing landmark projects throughout the world. In 1977, Baker engineers designed the New River Gorge Bridge in West Virginia, at that time the world's longest single span steel arch bridge. Baker's important projects extend internationally and include infrastructure improvements in Afghanistan and a 2,600 mile fiber optic network linking Mexico's major cities with the United States.

Baker employees continue to exemplify their core principles of leadership and the development of an employee and client focused company. All Michael Baker employees, from interns to the Chairman of the Board of Directors, take time to engage in the communities they serve.

I also have personal experience with the Michael Baker Corporation, having worked as a summer intern on a highway construction project when I was studying engineering in college. Lessons from that internship still help me today as I serve on the Transportation Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the great service that the Michael Baker Corporation and its employees have provided for 75 years. May their dedication and work ethic serve as an example to all.

HONORING MR. STEVE ANDERSON FOR RECEIVING NATO'S SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer Mr. Steve Anderson my sincere congratulations on being named a recipient of the 2014 NATO Science and Technology Organization's (STO) Scientific Achievement Award for his outstanding contributions in the realm of defense data farming methodologies. This award is NATO's highest honor for those in the defense and science technology industry. There is no question that the contributions from him and the MSG-088 task group to NATO's humanitarian assistance and disaster relief will continue for years to come.

Mr. Anderson is a fine example to his fellow citizens of dedication, selflessness, and commitment to the common good around the world. I thank him for his devotion to NATO preparedness, and I commend him on this special occasion. Again, congratulations on this much deserved award.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RICHARD CHOI BERTSCH

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Richard Choi Bertsch, who passed away unexpectedly last weekend at the age of 56.

Richard was an integral member and leader in the Korean American community. His business acumen matched the respect he garnered from his peers. He dedicated much of his life to important causes, especially the fervent fight on behalf of the so-called "comfort women"—women who were sexually enslaved by the Japanese Imperial Army during the World War II.

Born on August 9, 1958, to his parents, Kenneth and Kyung Bertsch, Richard attended elementary school in Seoul, South Korea. In 1973, he came to the U.S. with his family, where he grew up in Southern California. A graduate of the University of California, Irvine, he started multiple electronics business.

He found his true passion as a civic leader, and he was exceptionally skilled in connecting people of diverse backgrounds and communities. Richard founded the Korean American Democratic Committee and helped found the Korean American Coalition, serving as chairman of its Orange County chapter.

Richard was a selfless individual who cared passionately about justice and the civic spirit. To put it simply, he left a deep and lasting impact on his family and his many friends from all walks of life. When a 2004 South Korean book blamed Jews for the attacks of September 11, 2001, Richard joined with Rabbi Abraham Cooper to fight its publication. Also, in 2008, when police killed a young artist, Richard led the Korean American Advisory Commission to bring the case before federal authorities for a civil-rights violation review.

Just last month, when Los Angeles Times asked about his hopes for the future in Washington, he said, if "The two parties sincerely work[ed] together for the betterment of our country, rather than constantly [being] locked in ideological gridlock . . . it would give some hope to people that politics does matter." Each of us in this hallowed chamber should take these words to heart.

My heart was broken when I learned of Richard's untimely passing. Yet, I believe it is safe to assume, Richard continues to task each of us to continue our service and dedication to the betterment of our community, and this nation.

Richard is survived by his wife Yang-Uk Kim, his sons Sunny and Sunoo, and his daughter Summer. Richard's family, friends, and I will miss him greatly.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart, I recognize and remember the life of Richard Choi Bertsch—a man whom I am honored to have called a dear friend.

RECOGNIZING DR. KAREN STOUT

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Dr. Karen Stout for her outstanding dedication as President of Montgomery County Community College.

Dr. Stout is moving on after fourteen years of service as President. Her tenure has brought the college success and expansion at a time of remarkable transformation in higher education. Under her leadership, the college has been an example of management and vision for community colleges in Pennsylvania.

Her initiatives have reshaped the college's campus, forged new and important partnerships in the Montgomery County community, and given students access to programs that will teach them the skills they need for the jobs of the future. Dr. Stout is a visionary not only in her work with students and the community, but also because of the particular emphasis she has had on creating opportunity for our veterans. Her leadership will certainly be missed, but she has left the college strong and poised for continued prosperity in the future.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 7th district of Pennsylvania, I want to thank Dr. Stout for all she has done to educate countless students and I look forward to working with her again in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS OF THE NAMI OF SYRACUSE

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) of Syracuse to the 24th District. Since 1981, NAMI of Syracuse has worked to improve the lives of countless families in Central New York who have relatives suffering from mental illness.

NAMI of Syracuse is a leader in the Central New York effort to expand awareness of and dialogue on children's mental health care. Due to the organization's programs that aim to improve children mental illness early identification, outreach, and family education, NAMI of Syracuse is being honored by NAMI of New York State at the What's Great in Our State—A Celebration of Children's Mental Health Awareness event.

I have personally pledged to increase accessibility to children's mental health resources in Central New York. I am proud to recognize NAMI of Syracuse for their work on this issue and the tremendous service they are providing to the communities of the 24th District.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
JANINE FOSTER WOODY

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplished and honorable life of my good friend, Janine Foster Woody. Sadly, Janine has recently passed away and is mourned by many.

Janine was one of the most dedicated and warm hearted people I was fortunate enough to know for many years. Her endless resume of involvement with local schools and the community are difficult to portray in words. She devoted much of her time to education and helping students and community members alike. It was an honor and a privilege to have known her.

As a member of the Dallas County School Board, and chair of the Technology Committee, she worked with various Independent School District (ISD) boards and superintendents to better technological services provided to the ISDs. Janine was also elected to the Texas Association of School Boards' Legislative Advisory Committee and the North Texas Council of Governments. Her hard work and generosity reached far and wide in North Texas.

Janine's involvement in Christ United Methodist Church also brought her great joy; she dedicated valuable time and energy to teaching and volunteering in the church for many years. Her other activities included chamber of commerce Education Committees, Farmers Branch Women's Club, Garland Asian American Festival Committee, Richardson Community Band, and several public service posts, along with many others. Janine was a great role model and someone you would want members of the community looking up to.

Janine received a B.A. in History and English from Northwestern University as well as a Master of Library and Information Science degree from the University of North Texas. A thesis she wrote on ethnic bibliographies was published in the Wilson Library Journal.

As a precinct chairwoman, and Headquarters Chairwoman of the Dallas County Republican Party, she worked hard in keeping people involved and informed on many issues. She organized and maintained events, started clubs, and generally performed above and beyond her civic duties. Janine's work ethic and

ability to keep people involved in the community will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize and celebrate the eventful and prosperous life of Janine Foster Woody. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KILGORE COLLEGE RANGERETTES

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the First District of Texas has been blessed as the birthplace of many remarkable individuals who have made notable contributions that have enriched lives well beyond the borders of Texas. One such example was born from a rather simple concept, yet grew into a worldwide movement. It is a great pleasure to stand in honor of the world famous collegiate drill team, the Kilgore College Rangerettes, as they celebrate their 75th anniversary this year.

The Rangerettes have long been considered the personification of talent and precision, the standard of excellence which has sparked an estimated \$8 billion industry and created more than fifty-thousand permanent jobs in the United States, according to one famed economist. The Rangerettes have inspired similar all-female dance drill teams, with an estimated 15,000 high school students and some 1,000 college students across the state of Texas taking part each year; while approximately 75,000 high school drill team members across the nation participate annually. The Rangerettes have been the impetus behind this major industry which has influenced lives and careers around the world.

The precision dance team concept began in 1939, and came to fruition led by the incomparably talented Miss Gussie Nell Davis with their first halftime performance on September 15, 1940. The Rangerettes were originally intended to promote diversity among the student body at Kilgore College while also encouraging football fans to stay in their seats during halftime; but while effectively accomplishing these tasks, they also introduced something astoundingly innovative to the field of sports entertainment. This group of talented young women set into motion a revolutionary model for all future choreographed dance teams. Technical skill and absolute choreographed perfection, along with the incomparable high kick routines, characterized the Rangerettes' routines at their inception, and those words can still be used today to describe the captivating performances of these young women.

The world renowned Rangerettes have toured the United States multiple times, performing for U.S. Presidential inaugurations, professional sports venues, nationally televised parades, collegiate bowl games, and even Indy 500 race events. They have been featured on television, in films, and in widely circulated magazines and newspapers. In addition to the notoriety they have experienced here in the United States, the Rangerettes have headlined several international tours which have allowed them to perform for massive numbers of enthusiastic fans on four continents and in countless cities worldwide.

The commitment to preserving the legacy and rich heritage of the young women who have achieved the honor of being named a "Rangerette" does not end upon graduation, but is demonstrated through the continuing efforts of their Rangerettes Forever alumni organization. Rangerettes now and forever have enjoyed an accomplished and vibrant history of group performances and individual achievement, while bringing visibility and prestige to Kilgore College, east Texas and the State of Texas.

It is a distinct privilege to honor this remarkable organization today since they have been so hard-working, motivational, & inspirational. Please join me in recognizing and congratulating the Kilgore College Rangerettes on their 75th anniversary, a milestone now recorded in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

HONORING DOT PONDER

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to salute Mrs. Dot Ponder, a devoted Nashvillian and this year's Girl Scouts of Middle Tennessee honoree. I also have the great privilege of calling Dot my friend.

For more than thirty years, Dot devoted herself to the Girl Scouts. She registered with ten troops and served hundreds of girls as troop leader, instructor and camp director.

From sharing her love of the outdoors to teaching financial literacy, Dot's energy is endless. But her contributions didn't end when troop meetings were over. She taught civic responsibility and, through her example, she encouraged Girl Scouts to actively engage in their communities. She inspired girls to pursue the highest accolades in Girl Scouting, including the Gold and Silver Awards.

It is an honor to commend Dot Ponder for her contributions to the advancement of girls in our community through her tenure of devoted and humble service to the Girl Scouts of Middle Tennessee.

HONORING EVELYN COLLINS

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor the 33-year career of Evelyn Collins, who is retiring this week as a budget analyst for the United States Army Military District of Washington and Joint Force Headquarters-National Capital Region located on the historic Fort Leslie J. McNair in Washington, DC.

A native of Dothan, Alabama, Ms. Collins graduated from George Washington Carver High School in 1965. One year later, she joined the Army family as a military spouse. Ms. Collins began her career by working as a cashier and later became a teacher's aide. She attended Burlington County College in Pemberton, New Jersey, where she earned

her accounting certificate. She then began working extensively in the Department of Defense budget career field, culminating her career as a budget analyst for the Army since 2010.

Ms. Collins' service to our nation as both a military spouse and civil service employee has spanned the country: she has traveled, worked and lived in Fort Ord, California, Fort Wainwright, Alaska, Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, Fort Dix, New Jersey, Fort Gilliam, Georgia, and served two assignments with Defense Finance and Accounting Services in Orlando, Florida, and Fort Meade, Maryland.

Ms. Collins is the well-deserved recipient of numerous superior performance awards, incentive awards, certificates of appreciation and certificates of achievement. She has earned the Outstanding Financial Support Award, Peer Award and two commander's awards for her untiring work supporting the relief efforts with Hurricane Katrina as well as her subject matter expertise in the Bradley Manning court martial that drew worldwide media attention.

Throughout her career, Ms. Collins has always upheld the highest standards of integrity and professional conduct. Her colleagues have described her as a "trusted professional who took care of Soldiers, Army Families and Army Civilians."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join with me today to honor and thank Ms. Evelyn Collins as well as her two sons, Calvin and Adrian, for their unwavering support of our country. The sheer longevity of her career is indicative of her strength of character and her dedication to the United States. She has been an invaluable Army employee that will be difficult to replace. I wish her many more years of happiness and success in her retirement.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes:

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support and as a cosponsor of the Huizenga-Hahn Amendment to increase funding in the 2016 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Operations and Maintenance Account by \$36,306,000. This modest increase, offset by reducing funding for the Department of Energy, Departmental Administration, by \$36.7 million, will benefit Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund related projects.

I have the good fortune to represent the city of Boston and its Port. Like many ports in this country, the port of Boston is vital to the local and regional economies, generating \$2.4 billion in economic benefits annually and supporting 34,000 jobs.

In fact, every one of our 50 states relies on seaports for imports and exports, totaling

some \$3.8 billion worth of goods moving through U.S. seaports each day, supporting more than 13 million jobs across the country.

The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund was created in 1986 to ensure that we could maintain and expand our ports and harbors in order to facilitate commerce and drive our economy. For too long Congress has engaged in budgetary shell games, starving the fund and hampering our ability to undertake dredging projects critical to maintaining this vital infrastructure.

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, which the House passed overwhelmingly last year by a vote of 412–4, moved to rectify this situation by setting incremental target expenditures from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund that reaches 80% in 2020.

Mr. Chair, our amendment is simply in line with the amount overwhelmingly supported by my colleagues, increasing from \$1.178 billion to \$1.25 billion the amount allocated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, in order to support the critical needs of our nation's ports. The balance in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund at the beginning of fiscal 2016 will be approximately \$8.9 billion. The money is there. With the re-opening of the Panama Canal slated for next year we need to re-double our efforts to make certain that U.S. ports are prepared for increased commercial opportunities and will remain competitive.

All of our constituents benefit from the success of U.S. ports. It is time that we provide the resources to ensure that success. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF TORKLIFT CENTRAL

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and recognize Torklift Central from Kent, Washington, for their dedication to the community as demonstrated through their annual Turkey Challenge.

In 2011, with the economy in the depths of the recession and many families struggling as a result, the Kent Food Bank unexpectedly lost the majority of its funding with the holiday season just around the corner. This left many households in the area scrambling to find ways to feed their families. Fortunately, Torklift Central—a family-owned company based in Kent—stepped up to meet the needs of the community by forming the Turkey Challenge. The Challenge, which is heading into its fifth year this winter, pits local businesses against each other in a friendly competition to see who can collect the greatest amount of canned food items and cash donations for the food bank. One hundred percent of the proceeds go to providing Thanksgiving meals for residents and families who visit the Kent food bank during the holiday.

Every year, donations for the Turkey Challenge have grown in both the number of cans and monetary donations received. The goal for 2014 was 4,000 pounds of food and \$17,000, an ambitious goal that would have nearly doubled what they collected in the previous year. Participating companies far exceeded those

goals, bringing in 10,820 pounds of canned food and \$22,418 in donations. Altogether, the Turkey Challenge has raised \$56,560 and collected 16,804 pounds of food.

Without the continued dedication of Torklift Central to the Kent Food Bank, many families in our community would go without a Thanksgiving meal and food throughout the year. No longer does the food bank have to turn away families on this special day and at other times during the year due to lack of supplies. Because of Torklift Central's outstanding initiative and contributions, the community can give less fortunate families a memorable Thanksgiving.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Torklift Central. Their service to our community is an inspiration to all organizations across the State of Washington.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF SONNY DIXON

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Sonny Dixon for his hard work and dedication throughout his broadcast career and public service.

Mr. Dixon is a proud Savannah native, who has readily volunteered to help out in and around his community for decades, serving on numerous boards, including various Chamber of Commerce boards, the United Way of the Coastal Empire, American Cancer Society, Savannah Technical College, Boy Scouts of the Coastal Empire, and many more. Mr. Dixon was twice elected to serve on the Garden City Council before moving on to the Georgia General Assembly. Continuing his public service, Mr. Dixon was elected to five terms in the Georgia House of Representatives, where he served on the key committees of Appropriations, Rules, Transportation, and Interstate Cooperation, on which he served as vice-chairman. Mr. Dixon later retired from elected office in 1997.

After 18 years on the anchor desk at WTOG, Mr. Dixon is set to retire on May 31, 2015. Mr. Dixon has been a fixture on the Savannah broadcasting landscape for decades covering various issues. He has garnered national attention through his appearances on CBS Evening News, the CBS Early Show, CNN, and the Montel Williams Show. Mr. Dixon has also been featured in Newsweek magazine and in other major newspapers. Mr. Dixon has claimed many awards and achievements, including the Edward R. Murrow Award, Georgia Associated Press Award for Best Documentary and Georgia's Best TV Anchor by the Associated Press. He has also received an Emmy for Best Anchor which distinguishes him amongst both large and small television markets.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join his colleagues, family and many friends in celebrating Mr. Sonny Dixon. He will always be respected for his civic service in assisting and informing our community and the State of Georgia.

HONORING THE 416TH/412TH THEATER ENGINEER COMMANDS AND ENGINEER COMMANDS ASSOCIATION MEMORIAL WALL DEDICATION

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the opening of a new memorial wall dedicated by the 416th/412th Theater Engineer Commands along with the Engineer Commands Association in honor of members of the armed forces who have paid the ultimate price in service to our country.

The memorial, located at the Parkhurst United States Army Reserve Center in Darien, Illinois, features pictures of the brave service members who laid down their lives for their country. The 416th/412th Theater Engineer Commands and the Engineer Commands Association worked countless hours planning, designing, and fundraising for the memorial which will stand in testament to sacrifices made by their fellow soldiers.

I would like to thank the 416th/412th Theater Engineer Commands and Engineer Commands Association for honoring our fallen heroes with this memorial wall.

HONORING PHYLLIS MITZEN WITH THE NATIONAL LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my dear friend Phyllis Mitzen on her well-deserved recognition from the National Association of Social Workers. Tonight, Phyllis will be presented with their prestigious 2014 National Lifetime Achievement award. This is a fitting accolade as she has devoted most of her adult life to the social work profession and to improving the care and lives of older Americans.

Phyllis is the co-director of the Center for Long-Term Care Reform in Chicago. She is known and respected as a leader in gerontological social work, has authored books and scholarly papers in the field, and was integral in reforming long-term care in Illinois by helping to craft trailblazing reform legislation. In addition, she serves on a number of statewide advisory boards and commissions. She has also influenced and inspired many as the coordinator of the Older Adult Studies Program at the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration.

Before her work at the Center for Long-Term Care Reform, Phyllis spent close to 25 years helping to establish the Council for Jewish Elderly's important presence in our community, first as Director of Home and Community Based Services and ultimately as Director of Government Affairs. Under Phyllis' leadership, CJE Senior Life expanded programming to offer a myriad of services, from evaluating the evolving needs of seniors to adult day pro-

grams and other supportive services which allow individuals to remain in their home and community with dignity. It is critical that such comprehensive and supportive programs are available in our area, and CJE Senior Life gives seniors appropriate services through professional care. It is a testament to Phyllis' amazing contributions to seniors and their families.

Phyllis has served as a mentor and friend to many. I join with them in applauding her steadfast commitment to fighting for the dignity and care of older Americans and in thanking her for her decades of work in our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAUREEN MARINELLI

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Maureen Marinelli, a thirty-two year veteran letter carrier for the United States Postal Service and the former president of the Massachusetts State Letter Carriers Association. As someone who served as a letter carrier in the past, I applaud her dedicated service to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Ms. Marinelli's career as a letter carrier began in 1983. Almost immediately, it was clear Maureen Marinelli was an exemplary leader among the Massachusetts Letter Carriers, and her peers took notice. Maureen worked tirelessly to help letter carriers across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. She spent her career working at the grassroots level, representing and advocating for her fellow letter carriers at the state and local level. She did this while remaining a loyal letter carrier. Because of her day to day drive to listen to local letter carriers, she understood the fundamental needs of the men and women we rely on to get our mail.

After twenty years of distinguished service as a letter carrier, her peers elected her the president of the Massachusetts State Letter Carriers Association in 2004 and then again in 2011. During both terms in office, Maureen worked with labor groups across Massachusetts in order to better serve her letter carriers. Because of her hard work, she improved the lives of men and women across the Commonwealth by ensuring that our mail was delivered on time and with a smile.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Maureen Marinelli on this remarkable occasion. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her a wonderful retirement and many years of happiness, as well as in thanking her for working tirelessly as an advocate for letter carriers across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

RECOGNIZING RAINIER BEACH HIGH SCHOOL

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Rainier Beach High School in Seattle, Washington for increasing its gradua-

tion rate by 25 percent since 2011. Located in the southeastern region of Seattle along the shores of Lake Washington, Rainier Beach High School first opened its doors in 1960, and is currently home to about 400 students from the 9th Congressional District.

In previous years, Rainier Beach suffered low enrollment and graduation numbers, as well as high dropout rates. This suddenly changed two years ago when parents, staff, and community members of the Rainier Beach neighborhood pushed for an investment in an International Baccalaureate (IB) advanced learning program. This investment was made to improve the educational outcomes for all students at Rainier Beach. IB is a proven academic curriculum for 11th and 12th grade students across the nation that challenges young adults and prepares them for higher education. Students who have successfully completed IB classes have the opportunity to earn an IB diploma, making them more academically competitive in the college application process.

Since the implementation of this program, Rainier Beach High School has witnessed tremendous improvements in the academic success of their students. Graduation rates have risen substantially in recent years, with 79 percent of seniors graduating with high school diplomas this past spring. Moreover, Rainier Beach continues to exceed the Seattle School District's average graduation rate of 74 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I congratulate Rainier Beach High School on this academic achievement. I am extremely proud of Rainier Beach for valuing education and promoting growth. Their success story sets the bar very high for schools around the country.

2015 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ART COMPETITION

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the artistic ability of a young man from my Congressional District, Andrew Lowery from the Pittsburgh Creative and Performing Arts School. Mr. Lowery is the winner of the 2015 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania's High School Art Competition, "An Artistic Discovery." Mr. Lowery's artwork, a self-portrait in graphite, was selected from a number of outstanding entries to this year's competition.

In fact, 63 works from 15 different schools in Pennsylvania's 14th Congressional District were submitted to our panel of respected local artists. It's a real tribute to Mr. Lowery's skill and vision that his work was chosen as the winner of this year's competition.

Mr. Lowery's artwork will represent the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in the national exhibit of high school students' artwork that will be displayed in the United States Capitol over the coming year. I encourage my colleagues as well as any visitor to Capitol Hill to view Mr. Lowery's artwork, along with the winning entries from the high school art contests held in other Congressional Districts, which will be on display in the

Capitol tunnel. It is amazing to walk through this corridor and see the interpretation of life through the eyes of these young artists from all across our country.

Cassandra Finnegan from Springdale High School was awarded second place for her watercolor and pen composition "The Early Bird." Miranda Miller from Woodland Hills High School received third place for her acrylic on board painting entitled "Corner of Hanover and Church." Faiza Amir from Woodland Hills High School was awarded fourth place for her acrylic painting on canvas entitled "Flat Out Majestic," and Jared Bollman from Northgate High School received the fifth place award for his untitled chalk pastel composition.

In addition, Honorable Mention Awards were presented to works by Shannon Nelis from East Allegheny High School, Andrew Beninate and Katie McGregor from Montour High School, Spencer Condon from the Pittsburgh Creative and Performing Arts School Jimmy Niu from the Pittsburgh Science and Technology Academy, Shannon Kelly from Riverview High School, Brandon Konkiel and Natalie Walker from Sto-Rox High School, and Isis Duncan of Woodland Hills High School.

I would like to recognize all of the participants in this year's 14th Congressional District High School Art Competition, "An Artistic Discovery:" from Carrick High School, Kiera Manus; from East Allegheny High School, Adrienne DeLisi, Katlin McArdle, Shannon Nelis, and Abigail Petrocelli; from Montour High School, Andrew Beninate, Grady Butler, Joanne Fowkes, Erin McCleary, Katie McGregor, and Olivia Trevenen; from Northgate High School, Jared Bollman and Jesron Hall; from Penn Hills High School, Racine James, Anna Lintelman, Areanna Russell, and Sarah Wheeler; from the Pittsburgh Creative and Performing Arts School, Spencer Condon, Andrew Lowery, Gigi Varlotta, and Rosalea Williams; from Pittsburgh Science & Technology Academy, Jimmy Niu; from Pittsburgh Westinghouse School, Margaret Ahmad-Revis, Christjon Malloy, Layla Miller, William Penn, and Alanna Young; from Riverview High School, Shannon Kelly, Kylie Mericle, and Kelly O'Donnell; from Serra Catholic High School, Tyler J. Gedman, Kalin Greene, Victoria Hart, Jen Pricener, Erin Thomas, and Rachel Vidil; from South Allegheny High School, Matthew Dougher, Noah Elder, Adriann Frantish, Tywan Igles, Nicolette Ruhl, and Lesley Taylor; from Springdale High School, Cassandra Finnegan, Zachary Lamperski, Maria Lucas, Marisa Stover, Emily Thomm, and Milana Yaksich; from Sto-Rox High School, Brian Berry, Tiekia Berry, Brandon Konkiel, Alanna Molter, Katelyn Parker, and Natalie Walker; from Wilson Christian Academy, Nicole Bonomo and Haley Peretic; from Woodland Hills High School, Faiza Amir, Isis Duncan, Miranda Miller, Rayven Smith, and Tonee Turner.

I would like to thank these impressive young artists for allowing us to share and celebrate their talents, imagination, and creativity. The efforts of these students in expressing themselves in a powerful and positive manner are no less than spectacular.

I hope that all of these individuals continue to utilize their artistic talents, and I wish them all the best of luck in their future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO THE ROTARY CLUB OF COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Rotary Club of Council Bluffs, Iowa. The Club was chartered by Rotary International on April 1, 1915. The members of this Club exemplify the Rotary Motto: "Service Above Self and One Profits Most Who Serves Best." The Club Members convey this philosophy of unselfish volunteer service at every opportunity.

In 1913, a young Council Bluffs businessman, while on a business trip to New York City, came upon a Rotary International convention and asked, "What is Rotary?" He was told, "It is an organization for the prevention of what is harmful to business and society; and the promotion of that which is helpful." That same spirit is alive and well within the Rotary Club of Council Bluffs today. The Club members actively participate in community activities, promote a college scholarship fund, hold an annual food drive, sponsor a 5th grade career fair, and hold fundraisers throughout the year to support their activities. This Club is a reflection of the mission of Rotary International, "to promote service to others, promote integrity, and advance world understanding, goodwill, and peace through its fellowship of business, professional, and community leaders."

The Rotary Club of Council Bluffs has made a difference in serving the Council Bluffs community. The members of the past 100 years have been dedicated to helping and serving others and it is a great honor to recognize them today. I know my colleagues in the House join me in honoring their accomplishments. I thank them for their service and wish them all the very best moving forward.

HONORING MARK DIEL

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mark Diel as he departs the Children's Health Initiative in Napa County. As the founding Executive Director of this vital organization, Mr. Diel shepherded its growth and greatly increased access to healthcare among the less fortunate in our community.

During his time as the head of the initiative, Mr. Diel enrolled 16,000 children and their families in Napa in comprehensive affordable health insurance and put into place systems which ensured that over ninety-nine percent of its clients received all the healthcare services they needed. Eighty-seven percent of the Initiative's clients also retain their coverage each year, a rate that is far higher than the state average.

Mr. Diel's dedication to ensuring children and low-income communities have the quality healthcare has been a lifelong passion. In addition to heading the Children's Health Initiative, he has served as a WIC manager in Yolo

County and as Director at QueensCare. While at QueensCare, he built relationships with inner-city schools and families that led to valuable mobile medical, dental, and optometric clinics throughout their geographic region, serving more than 60,000 Los Angeles children and factory workers annually. He also founded Promotores Comunitarios, a leadership training program that fosters leadership through training and deploying of community health promoters.

Mark was born and lives in Davis, CA, with his wife, Tara, and their two children. Throughout his career, Mark has always been a bold advocate for vulnerable groups, a professional risk taker, and an outstanding community leader.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we honor Mark Diel at this time. He has worked tirelessly to connect underserved communities, children, and others to quality healthcare services, and as a leader in Napa County his work has made our community stronger and healthier.

HONORING GIVE SOMETHING BACK FOUNDATION

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Carr and the Give Something Back Foundation.

In 2003, Lockport, Illinois resident Bob Carr founded the Give Something Back Foundation to give well performing but underprivileged high school students a chance to receive a college education by providing scholarship and mentorship opportunities.

The Give Something Back Foundation's scholarship program is currently supporting 190 students, and has helped many more who would not have been able to afford a college education. The foundation offers full scholarships to students from 21 high schools throughout Will County and partners with local universities to ensure that students receive mentors to help them during their college career.

I would like to thank Bob Carr and the Give Something Back Foundation for their continued dedication to improving lives and building futures for young people in our community.

RECOGNIZING JANIE SACCO, RECIPIENT OF THE WASHINGTON STATE VETERAN SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCATE AWARD

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Ms. Janie Sacco, Vice President and SBA Loan Officer at Kitsap Bank, on receiving the 2015 Washington State Veteran Small Business Advocate Award from the SBA.

For years, Janie's main focus has been assisting military veterans with business loans, with a special focus on women, minority, veteran-owned small businesses and non-profits.

Janie works tirelessly to discover qualifying veteran-owned businesses to receive a certification as a veteran-owned business by the Washington State Department of Veteran Affairs (WDVA). These certifications allow businesses to apply for SBA loans and benefit from the additional assistance that veterans deserve. Janie's dedication has resulted in many local businesses qualifying for SBA assistance, which has helped to spur economic growth in the region.

In addition to her work at Kitsap Bank, Janie also works with the SBA's SCORE and VBOC programs, providing classes on financial education, as well as with the SBA's Boots-to-Business program. During her spare time, she volunteers by providing her expertise and services in the South Sound region in order to strengthen veteran-owned businesses and their finances. Janie has demonstrated—through her career and volunteer service—her dedication to veterans and veteran-owned businesses. Our community and regional economy have benefited greatly as a result and I am proud to call her a constituent.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize and congratulate Janie Sacco on receiving the 2015 Washington State Veteran Small Business Advocate Award from the Small Business Association.

HONORING MR. JOHN RABUN

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. John Rabun for his absolute passion for child safety and his many years of service to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

A graduate of Savannah High School, Mr. Rabun continued his education at Armstrong State University and earned his master's in social work from Mercer University. Following his degree, Mr. Rabun began his career in legal work for the ACLU of Kentucky where he helped "deinstitutionalize" children after their time in public homes for non-criminal activity and later worked as a chief probation officer for a county juvenile justice system. In 1980, Mr. Rabun and one of his colleagues formed a local exploited child unit, uniting social workers with police force during a season of high-profile cases of missing children.

Mr. Rabun wrote about the need for a clearinghouse operation for missing and exploited children for the U.S. Department of Justice, and in 1984 wrote a grant that would become the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Mr. Rabun ran the center's operations, built up the staff and trained tens of thousands internationally on preventing abduction, all while continuing to rescue children. He served as the communication link between many government units and helped to reach the public through billboards and news media sources. After nearly 30 years as the executive vice president of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Mr. Rabun now works part-time for the Alexandria, Virginia, office from his home on Tybee Island.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor Mr. John Rabun for his work that led to the rescue of 80,000 children. I am

honored to join his colleagues, family and friends in celebrating many years of dedication to the safety of our children.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,898,676,069.23. We've added \$7,525,021,627,456.15 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE BIRTHDAY OF BOBBY DOLD

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish my son, Bobby Dold, a happy birthday.

Bobby turns eleven years old today. He was born in Evanston, Illinois, and since that day in 2004, has kept me, his mother, Danielle, and his two sisters, Harper and Honor always on our toes.

Bobby continues to grow and develop as a young man and an athlete. As a member of the Dold family, Bobby excels in multiple sports, including football, hockey, and lacrosse. Bobby brightens every room he walks into and makes friends with everyone he meets. It is clear that he has a true zest for life, and I hope that he continues to grow that enthusiasm in the years to come.

Bobby enjoys visiting the beach of Lake Michigan with his proud grandparents, Nana and Chief, Papa and Granma, his aunts and uncles, and all of his cousins.

I look forward to watching Bobby grow and mature into a fine independent young man. I hope that Bobby will continue to be a shining light to our family and community. Happy Birthday Bobby.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LOCAL TASK FORCES ON 21ST CENTURY POLICING ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Local Task Forces on 21st Century Policing Act, to assist localities in carrying out some of the recommendations of President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing and the Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, both of which detail the need to strengthen relations between local communities and local law en-

forcement. The bill would provide grants to local police departments to create local task forces on 21st century policing to bring police, representatives of the community, and public officials together to identify issues in their own communities, best policing practices for local police, and other ways to strengthen relations between the community and police departments. Existing funds from the Department of Justice's Grant Program would support local governments establishing the task forces.

The task forces, modeled after President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, would allow local communities to identify the best ways to create an effective partnership between local law enforcement and the community they serve while reducing crime and increasing trust. The task forces could serve as a resource to address racial profiling in the United States by creating a partnership that encourages each party to take ownership of the issues and then proceeding to implement practical policing practices acceptable to all concerned.

The creation of task forces could be an important step toward easing the tensions between local law enforcement and the community. In addition, the task forces would serve to engage local law enforcement and local stakeholders in a transparent public process instead of being at odds. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

RECOGNIZING HELEN LEUZZI

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the founding Executive Director of The Sophia Way, Helen Leuzzi, for being recognized by Seattle CityClub as a recipient of the 2015 Washington State Jefferson Award.

The Jefferson Award is given to the unsung heroes who are making a difference in their community through public service. Also known as the "Nobel Prize" of social service, the Seattle CityClub awards the Jefferson Award to community leaders who exemplify an exceptional amount of volunteerism and action to better their communities.

In 2006, Helen began serving as the Outreach Chair at the Bellevue First Congregational Church, where her passion was ignited to help meet the needs of the eastside's homeless and low-income women. In collaboration with other community organizations, Helen helped to create a women's day center known as Angeline's Day, which eventually inspired her to create a center that would serve the needs of women at all hours of the day. This day center would later grow into what is known today as The Sophia Way.

Today, The Sophia Way offers life skills training, social services, shelter, and additional resources to help women gain stability and independence. As the founding Executive Director, Helen has demonstrated an unyielding commitment to combating issues faced by homeless and low income women in our community. Her dedication and selflessness have paved the way for the success and growth of this organization, which has become an important asset to the region.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize Helen Leuzzi for receiving Seattle CityClub's Washington State Jefferson Award and for her commitment to serving vulnerable populations in our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOROTHY
PETERSON

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Dorothy "Dot" Peterson as she celebrates her 100th birthday this year. It is my honor to join with her family and friends in marking this incredible milestone and wishing her many more years of health and happiness.

Born in Brooklyn, New York on May 15, 1915, Dot was the sixth of eight children. Her parents, Hannah and Kristian Nilson, had immigrated to the United States from Norway. In 1919, their family moved to North Long Branch, New Jersey where Dot spent most of her childhood. She graduated from Long Branch High School in 1931 and earned her teaching degree from Newark Normal School (now Kean University) in 1935.

In 1939, Dot married her beloved husband Harold Peterson of Monmouth Beach, New Jersey. Together they had 6 children and lived in Long Branch for 11 years before moving to Monmouth Beach in 1950. In 2005, Dot and Harold moved from their cherished family home to Kensington Court in Tinton Falls, New Jersey where Dot still resides today.

Dot's dynamic spirit and love of life is reflected in her family. She is proud of her children, eleven grandchildren and 15 great-grandchildren with which she can share her accomplished and fulfilling life.

In addition to raising a beautiful family, Dot has always been an active member of her community, looking to improve the well-being of others. She taught first grade at the Broadway School in Long Branch for seven years and was a member of the parent-teacher associations at Monmouth Beach School, Long Branch High School and Shore Regional High School. She was also part of a group of women who helped create the first free-standing library in Monmouth Beach and she served as a long-time member of the Ladies Auxiliary of Monmouth Beach. Dot continues to remain involved and energetic at Kensington Court, participating in art and exercise classes, prayer group and the Resident Board.

Dot is also an engaged, life-long member of Asbury United Methodist Church in North Long Branch, where she has served as president of the Women's Society of Christian Service (later renamed the United Methodist Women) and a church trustee. She was also involved with the Sunday School and played in the bell choir. Family, community and church continue to be of utmost importance to Dot and her remarkable involvement is truly admirable.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring Mrs. Dorothy Peterson as she celebrates her 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING CHAPIN HIGH
SCHOOL GOVERNMENT STUDENTS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am grateful to extend my sincere appreciation to Chapin High School's senior Government class. As part of their study on the legislative branch, these bright young men and women sent informed questions to my office about timely and important topics such as redistricting and immigration.

I appreciate Lucas Barnes, Kenly Derrick, Heather Dominick, Shelby Green, Trent Hodges, Abby Malcom, Katherine Meyers, Stephen Page, and Keely Wilson for their interest in and study of the federal government. I support Mr. Jody Haltiwanger, the Advanced American Government teacher at Chapin High School, who inspired his students to fully engage in the legislative process by contacting their elected officials.

I am honored to represent these young Americans in the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, and am confident of their future success.

A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL JANET
WOLFENBARGER

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to pay tribute to General Janet Wolfenbarger, the first female four-star general for the United States Air Force, for her 35 years of distinguished and honorable service in the United States Air Force and to our Nation.

General Wolfenbarger has had a distinguished career, beginning with her graduation from the United States Air Force Academy. She has held a variety of assignments at headquarters Electronic Security Command and Air Force Systems Command. The General has held several positions in the F-22 System Program office, served as the F-22 Lead Program Element Monitor and was the B-2 System Program Director for the Aeronautical Systems Center. She commanded the Aeronautical Systems Center's C-17 Systems Group, Mobility Systems Wing. She was the Service's Director of the Air Force Acquisition Center of Excellence at the Pentagon, and then served as Director of the Headquarters AFMC Intelligence and Requirements Directorate. She served as AFMC Vice Commander and as the Military Deputy to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisitions.

As Commander of AFMC, General Wolfenbarger authorized and directed groundbreaking initiatives, revolutionizing how the Air Force and AFMC will conduct business for years to come. Gen Wolfenbarger oversaw the successful reorganization of AFMC from 12-Centers to 5-Centers. This dramatic re-

invention of the Command led to a myriad of innovative mission and cost effectiveness programs, such as the Air Force Life Cycle Management Center's Should Cost initiative and the Air Force Sustainment Center's Road to a Billion and Beyond. Furthermore, she collaborated with the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Acquisition) to develop the Bending the Cost Curve initiative, an effort designed to improve internal Air Force acquisition processes, enhance industry interactions throughout the acquisition lifecycle, and expand competition among traditional and non-traditional industry partners. Finally, she fulfilled the Secretary of the Air Force's vision for the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center reorganization effort and guided the stand-up of the Air Force Installation and Mission Support Center.

She received numerous military awards for her service including the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal, and the Air Force Achievement Medal. She also received the highest honor from the Air Force enlisted corps, the Order of the Sword.

I have known General Wolfenbarger for many years and deeply value the service she provided to our country. Although she will be sorely missed, I wish her nothing but the best in her future endeavors. General Wolfenbarger encompasses a myriad of noble traits but her honesty, her ability to provide straight assessment and her uncompromising ethical character have truly set her apart from the rest in her distinguished career. Her service and her dedication to duty honor the Air Force and our great nation. General Wolfenbarger truly exemplifies the core values of the Air Force, "Integrity First, Service Before Self, Excellence in All We Do."

COMMENDING THE SEATTLE
TIMES

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Seattle Times on winning a Pulitzer Prize for "Breaking News Reporting" this year for their coverage of the Oso, Washington mudslide. This is the third time in just five years that the Seattle Times has received this prestigious honor, and their tenth total Pulitzer Prize. Although Editor Kathy Best said that the paper simply "did what any good newsroom should do when a big story breaks", it is clear that they went above and beyond and raised the bar for reporters and news publications across the country.

The Seattle Times is the largest daily paper in Washington State and has been serving the greater Seattle area since 1891. This latest achievement only adds to their legacy of community service and I look forward to many more years of them reporting the news of my home state.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF DR. QUINTARD TAYLOR

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Dr. Quintard Taylor of the University of Washington on receiving the 2015 Washington State Jefferson Award from Seattle CityClub.

The Jefferson Award is given to the unsung heroes who make a difference in their community through public service. Also known as the "Nobel Prize" of social service, the Seattle CityClub presents the Jefferson Award to community leaders who exemplify volunteerism and action to better their communities.

Today, Dr. Taylor is the Scott and Dorothy Bullitt Professor of American History at the University of Washington's Seattle campus, and has taught in Washington, Oregon, California, and Nigeria over the course of almost 40 years. He has edited, written and published multiple writings on African American History, providing his expertise on African American history specific to the American West.

In addition to his commitment to teaching, Dr. Taylor created a website resource called BlackPast.org, a non-profit website that features over 10,000 pages of information on African American history. In particular, this resource features voluntary academic contributions from various scholars verified through a rigorous process. This site is the largest reference center of its type and is a testament to his dedication to providing citizens with vital information on American history.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize and congratulate Dr. Quintard Taylor on receiving Seattle CityClub's 2015 Jefferson Award.

RECOGNIZING MERCEDES SANTANA

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mercedes Santana, a talented young lady and athlete.

Born on August 30, 2003, Mercedes has studied the martial art of Tae Kwon Do at Mechelle's Way Tae Kwon Do in Schenectady, New York for the last several years. During this time, she successfully earned the level of Red Belt, and she continues to pursue her goal of earning a Black Belt as well as completion of martial arts weapons training.

Mr. Speaker, in July of 2013, Mercedes attended and competed in the 2013 Junior Olympics, held in Detroit, Michigan. At this event Mercedes earned a Bronze Medal in Tae Kwon Do, a feat which currently makes her the only Junior Olympian in Schenectady, New York. This accomplishment has proven Mercedes to be an impressive role model for her peers and fellow New Yorkers.

Outside of Tae Kwon Do, Mercedes holds a diverse range of interests, including playing the drums, painting and reading.

Mr. Speaker, the Junior Olympics have been held over 30 times since their inception

in 1967. The event has included over 20 sports in this time span and the 2013 event alone had over 12,000 athletes in attendance. By winning a Bronze Medal, Mercedes has truly proven herself to be an impressive student of Tae Kwon Do and overall athlete.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other congressional colleagues join me in recognizing Mercedes Santana for her tremendous accomplishments, and to encourage Mercedes to continue to inspire those around her.

CELEBRATING BETHESDA ACADEMY'S 275TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 275th Anniversary of Bethesda Academy, Savannah's iconic boarding and day school for boys in grades six through 12.

Bethesda Academy was founded in 1740 by Reverend George Whitefield as a home for boys, and it has the distinction of being America's oldest child caring institute. This values-laden educational institution has raised the bar when it comes to educating Georgia's young men, strongly emphasizing Whitefield's founding mission to teach "a love for God, a love of learning and a strong work ethic." Today, Bethesda Academy is an AdvancEd accredited institute with 95 percent of its students graduating on time and 87 percent going on to higher education.

Designing its curriculum around the way that the boys learn most effectively, Bethesda Academy features a wildlife management program, an on-site video production studio, an organic farming program and a nationally-ranked chess team. Bethesda does not receive any state funding to operate and depends largely on private donations, external scholarship programs such as the Georgia GOAL Scholarship Program, annual fundraising, and a collection of on-campus business enterprises that cumulatively help meet the school's annual budget. Though the school has faced many challenges over the years due to funding, Bethesda has evolved into a thriving and award-winning middle and high school.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to commemorate the 275th Anniversary of Bethesda Academy. With a wide range of academic, athletic, vocational and spiritual development opportunities, there is no doubt that Bethesda is preparing these young men for future success in life.

PROTECTING CYBER NETWORKS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1560) to improve cybersecurity in the United States through

enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes:

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I submit the following exchange of letters regarding H.R. 1560:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2015.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN NUNES: I am writing concerning H.R. 1560, the "Protecting Cyber Networks Act," which your Committee ordered reported on March 26, 2015.

As you know, H.R. 1560 contains provisions within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 1560, the Committee on the Judiciary will not assert a jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,
BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, April 10, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act. As you noted, certain provisions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. As you also noted, the language of those provisions was the result of consultations with you in advance of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's consideration of the bill. I agree that your letter in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or any similar legislation.

I appreciate your willingness to forego consideration of the bill in the interest of expediting this legislation for floor consideration. I will include a copy of your letter and this response in our Committee's report on H.R. 1560 and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,
DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2015.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 26, 2015, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

ordered H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act reported to the House. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with regard to H.R. 1560 on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction. I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of the bill.

The bill contains provisions that fall within the Rule X subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The Committee has purview over the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA, 5 U.S.C. 552), which H.R. 1560 directly amends. Section 10 of the bill directly amends 5 U.S.C. 552 to create a new 5 U.S.C. 552(b) provision that exempts the entire Act from FOIA, including any subsequent amendments. Prior to floor consideration, we will work together to remove section 10 and consider improvements to other sections of the bill referencing 5 U.S.C. 552.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 1560, I will not request a sequential referral of the bill. However, I do so only with the understanding that this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 1560 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, April 13, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act. As you noted, certain provisions of the bill related to 5 U.S.C. § 552 fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. As you also noted, we have agreed to continue to work with you on these provisions. I agree that your letter in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or any similar legislation.

I appreciate your willingness to forego consideration of the bill in the interest of expediting this legislation for floor consideration. I will include a copy of your letter and this response in our Committee's report on H.R. 1560 and the Congressional Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

THE GLOBAL MAGNITSKY HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I recently chaired a hearing on the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 directed the President to publish and update a list of each person the President had reason to conclude was responsible for the detention, abuse, or death of Sergei Magnitsky, a legal and accounting adviser with Firestone Duncan, an international law and accounting firm with offices in Moscow and London.

William Browder, Chief Executive Officer of Hermitage Capital Management Ltd., who was one of the witnesses at the hearing, has provided a detailed account of the violent expropriation of the assets of Hermitage—the largest foreign investment brokerage in Russia—by rampant Russian Government corruption, bribery, fraud, forgery, cronyism, and outright theft.

Magnitsky had documented Hermitage's losses and other illicit financial dealings, including draining \$230 million from the Russian treasury by tax fraud. He was arrested in November 2008, reportedly for tax evasion, and denied medical care, family visits, or due legal process, in custody. He was beaten and tortured, and died in prison in November 2009. He was 37 years old and married with two young children.

The Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 targeted those who participated in related liability concealment efforts, financially benefited from Sergei Magnitsky's detention, abuse, or death, or were involved in the criminal conspiracy uncovered by Magnitsky, or were responsible for extrajudicial killings, torture, or other human rights violations committed against individuals seeking to expose illegal activity carried out by Russian officials, or against persons seeking to promote human rights and freedoms. The Act directed the Secretaries of State and Treasury to annually report to Congress on actions taken to implement the Act, including rejecting visa applications, revoking existing visas, and blocking property transactions, for persons the President put on the Magnitsky List.

The United States is a land of opportunity, but it should not be for those who misused and murdered Sergei Magnitsky. Without the original Magnitsky Act, the government officials and businesspeople who perpetrated crimes against a young man, against a major international firm, and against even the Russian people themselves by stealing from them, could have taken their ill-gotten gains and come to this country to purchase property and live the good life that the United States offers.

The hearing examined the need for H.R. 624, "The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act," which extends these human rights and anti-corruption tools to other countries. The House passed the 2012 act by a vote of 365–43, and there is now strong Majority and Minority co-sponsorship for H.R. 624.

Since the original Magnitsky Act became law on December 14, 2012, human rights vic-

tims and advocates from around the world, and anti-corruption champions, have asked for a Magnitsky Act for their specific country. H.R. 624 ensures—with minimal cost or burden on the United States—that our government gives some justice to victims and stands in solidarity with them in a tangible way, shines a spotlight on perpetrators, making them pariahs, and pressures governments to prosecute perpetrators who are their citizens.

The Global Magnitsky Act is intended to disrupt the impunity and comfort that far too many international human rights violators currently enjoy and to keep their tainted money out of our financial systems. It also fights the human rights abuses and corruption that generate national security, terrorism, and economic threats to the United States.

A few years ago, Teodorin Obiang Mangué son of the President of Equatorial Guinea, visited the United States regularly. Using funds siphoned from American companies operating in his country, he lived a glamorous life in Malibu, California, dating celebrities and collecting expensive cars. When France issued a warrant for his arrest after he refused to appear at a money-laundering hearing, his father provided him with diplomatic immunity to escape prosecution.

In June 2012, after years of trying to track Teodorin's wealth, the U.S. Department of Justice finally filed a lawsuit in a California court alleging massive money-laundering and listing, among the scandalous catalog of assets, his \$35 million Malibu mansion, with a four-hole golf course, tennis court and two swimming pools. That's just one of the acquisitions he made in the U.S.

The financial manipulations of young Mr. Obiang's family led in part to the closing of Riggs Bank in Washington, one of the capital's premier financial institutions. Such people should not be able to steal from foreign firms and their own people and use these funds to live lavishly in our country.

Similarly, those who torture and otherwise commit the worst human rights violations against others should not be welcome here either and I have written legislation over the years to enforce that principle. The Ethiopia Freedom, Democracy, and Human Rights Advancement Act of 2006 would have prevented officials who ordered the callous shooting of peaceful demonstrators in Ethiopia from entering this country. The Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 became law and required the U.S. Government to impose visa bans on any foreign national the Secretary of State has determined is directly involved in establishing or enforcing population control policies that force a woman to undergo abortions against her will or force a man or woman to undergo sterilization against his or her will. The Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2006 also became law and imposed visa bans and asset freezes on government officials from the Government of Belarus because of their violations of basic human rights and freedoms.

If we stand by quietly when governments refuse to prosecute human rights abusers and financial fraudsters, and then welcome those guilty of such crimes into the United States and into our financial systems, we are enabling their crimes. The 2012 Magnitsky Act was a major step in freeing ourselves from aiding and abetting international perpetrators. H.R. 624 makes the next step in taking a

stand against their crimes. If we are serious about rejecting their deeds, perhaps their governments, and other governments, will become more serious as well.

SHANNA PEEPLES OF AMARILLO
NAMED 2015 NATIONAL TEACHER
OF THE YEAR

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents, Shanna Peeples, who has been named the 2015 National Teacher of the Year by the Council of Chief State School Officers. She is the first Texas teacher to win the award since 1957.

Ms. Peeples is a high school English teacher at Palo Duro High School in Amarillo, Texas. She graduated from West Texas A&M University in 1997. After working as a disc jockey, medical assistant, pet sitter, and journalist at the Amarillo Globe-News covering education, the mother of three children began teaching 12 years ago.

Ms. Peeples was exposed to alcoholism, domestic violence, and poverty as a child. Those hardships help her empathize with her students, 85 percent of whom live below the poverty line and many having fled violent homelands from around the world. Just as her teachers made school her safe place where she could escape her fears through reading and writing, Ms. Peeples strives to give her students a sense of belonging. She wants them to know she is invested in their lives and in their futures. So much so, that she has had to help refugee parents who wanted their children to work rather than go to school understand the importance of education.

In addition to serving as the chair of her English department, she is a mentor and instructional coach for other teachers at her school. As she travels the nation over the next year, she plans to emphasize effective teaching methods for students in poverty or facing extreme challenges.

Ms. Peeples is the type of educator all parents want teaching our children. She is a shining example of the best of her profession. The fact that she has already been recognized as the Teacher of the Year for Texas and has now become the Teacher of the Year for the entire country makes everyone in our area—and especially our teachers and school systems—very proud.

RECOGNIZING SOUTH SEATTLE
COLLEGE STUDENT, DAVID YAMA

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to offer special recognition to David Yama, a South Seattle College student from the great state of Washington. Mr. Yama received national attention for his exemplary character in and out of the classroom.

As a member of the All-Washington Academic team, David was named a “New Cen-

tury Scholar” which is given to the top-community college scholar in each state. From there, David landed the top spot on the All-USA academic team, made up of the top-20 community college students from across the country. On April 20, 2015 the National Honor Society, Phi Theta Kappa, held a celebration to recognize David and his All-USA teammates in San Antonio, Texas. Of the top 20 in the nation, David was selected as the sole recipient of PTK’s David R. Pierce Scholarship and served as the speaker at the event where he shared his story of tragedy and triumph. Days later, his success was further recognized with a Jack Kent Cooke Foundation Scholarship—awarded to the nation’s top community college students to complete their bachelor’s degree at a four-year college or university.

Growing up in Ocean Shores, a small coastal city in Washington, David and his family—which includes his four siblings—lived in a one-bedroom hotel. David struggled in school and his parents were told that he needed behavioral drugs. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, his parents could not afford that type of medication for David. After receiving straight F’s, David dropped out of high school at the age of 14. One year later, David set sail—quite literally. After convincing his mother and the captain of the *Lady Washington*, he volunteered on a sailing trip to California. From there he worked on other ships and as David put it, jumped from “one dead-end job to another.”

At the age of 27, David came to the realization that an education was the key to a life of stability and greener pastures. As a West Seattle resident, David started taking prep classes to receive his GED at his local community college, South Seattle College.

With the encouragement of his GED instructor, Jane Harness, David quickly began to rebuild his confidence and his scores improved. As Jane put it, “this little switch turned on for him, and he became really determined.”

So determined, in fact, that after David earned his GED he continued his academic pursuits and will be earning an associate degree this spring. From there, David will continue his studies earning a bachelor’s degree and ultimately a Ph.D. in bio engineering.

In addition to holding a 3.96 GPA, David volunteers his time as a tutor and an environmentalist cleaning up West Seattle’s Duwamish River. He is quick to give credit to South Seattle College as the key to his success as he told the Seattle Times: “Once I started here—the environment was right, it was a 180 from what I thought I was capable of,” Yama said.

His academic achievements have been recognized in USA Today, Seattle’s NBC Affiliate (KING 5) and on the front page of the Seattle Times.

David’s story is one of inspiration and determination. He is just one of many students who have had to overcome seemingly impossible odds but met those challenges head-on and came out on top. He is living proof that the power of hope, determination and the human spirit are alive and well in this country. I’m proud that South Seattle College and David Yama are from the District that I represent. Please join me in recognizing their success.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I’d like to thank the Appropriations Committee and the Chairman for acting to impose greater discipline on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

We know that the future of nuclear power in the United States depends on having a credible nuclear safety regulator, and depends on the industry continuing to perform at a high level of safety. We feel strongly that the agency must continue its core mission of protecting public health and safety, but NRC must do so in a manner that does not add to the economic headwinds the industry faces.

I support the Committee’s direction to require the NRC’s rulemaking process to be Commission-driven in order to provide greater discipline, transparency, efficiency, and accountability.

THE EVENTS IN BALTIMORE

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend and chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, in offering condolences to the parents and family members of Freddie Gray.

I also want to say to Ms. Toya Graham that I feel and can appreciate her anguish and the pain that she showed the world a few days ago.

I want to say to her son, Michael that I have also felt his pain and anguish, having been on the receiving end of such discipline from my mother. But I want to say to him that he can rest assured that the love of his mother, her passion for his future, will pay great dividends if he continues to show the deference to her love and affection and her concern that he showed several days ago when he was the object of her frustrations.

Mr. Speaker, responding to the situation in Baltimore several days ago, President Obama said: “We can’t just leave this to the police. I think there are Police Departments that have to do some soul-searching. I think there are some communities that have to do some soul-searching.”

But, he went on to say: “I think we, as a country, have to do some soul-searching.” I want to join President Obama in calling for the country to do some soul-searching.

Let’s take a look at just a few of the institutions of learning in the Baltimore Community.

I would like to call attention to one school, Frederick Douglass High School, a school that

lists among its graduates the likes of Cab Calloway, Thurgood Marshall, and as I understand it the school the father of the current mayor of Baltimore also attended.

I understand there are 789 students at Frederick Douglass High School today. Eighty-three percent of them are listed in U.S. News & World Report's index as economically disadvantaged, and only 53 percent of them are listed as proficient in English, only 44 percent proficient in algebra.

I understand that Carver Vocational Technical High is 100 percent minority, with 79 percent of the students economically disadvantaged. Coppin Academy, 100 percent minority, with 77 percent economically disadvantaged.

Now, as we listen to all of the pundits, editorial writers reflect on what is taking place or has taken place in Baltimore, I would like to call attention to the lack of soul-searching that is taking place here in this body as we represent the people of America. We have just seen the conference report, or the budget, being proposed by the House Republicans. That conference agreement guts strategic investments in education, workforce training, public health, scientific research, advanced manufacturing, and public safety. It does nothing to help those Americans who are looking for jobs. It does nothing to boost paychecks of working Americans. It disinvests in America.

The Republicans' budget disinvests in America by slashing the nation's commitments to education, research, infrastructure, and other crucial drivers of economic prosperity. It pulls away from the ladders of opportunity that helps hard-working Americans get ahead.

In Education, the Republican Budget kicks 46,000 children out of Head Start, cuts \$1.2 billion in Title I education funding (enough for 17,000 teachers and aides serving 1.9 million students); cuts \$347 million in funding through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, (enough for 6,000 special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and related staff);

The Republican Budget also decimates job creation. It eliminates job training & employment services for more than 2.4 million workers; and eliminates the Manufacturing Extension Partnerships, which serve 30,000 small manufacturers that contribute to the creation of middle-class jobs and economic growth;

In the area of Housing, the Republican budget takes Housing Choice Vouchers away from 133,000 families and eliminates affordable housing assistance for another 20,000 families in rural America;

The Republican budget shreds the social safety net. It cuts \$300 billion from Agriculture Committee programs. The House budget cut roughly \$200 billion. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is the largest spending program in this committee's jurisdiction and appears to be the primary target of this cut (despite the fact that 80% of SNAP beneficiaries are children, elderly, disabled, someone caring for a child or disabled person, or are working);

My Republican friends underfund veterans' programs. They are proposing \$20 billion below the President's request over the next ten years.

They also increase taxes on hardworking families while giving massive tax cuts to the ultra-wealthy. They increase taxes on a typical working family by \$2,000, while giving millionaires an average tax cut of more than \$200,000; and let the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), and the Child Tax Credit expire.

Their budget puts college out of reach for millions of students. It freezes the maximum Pell grant and eliminates \$89 billion in congressionally approved Pell grant increases; and cuts total overall support for higher education by more than \$220 billion in the next decade.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF DR. KENNETH MILLER

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize my constituent, Kenneth Miller, PhD, RN, CFNP, FAAN, FAANP, for his service as President this year of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners (AANP).

Dr. Miller has had an exemplary career of service with more than 44 years of nursing experience. He received his BSN from the University of Michigan in 1978, a Master's in Medical/Surgery Nursing in 1980, and a PhD in Clinical Nursing Research from the University of Arizona in 1983. Dr. Miller received his Family Nurse Practitioner post-master's certification from the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences in 1998.

Prior to his term as AANP President, Dr. Miller served as the Associate Dean for Academic Administration at The Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He was also the Director of the School of Nursing for the University of Delaware and the Vice Dean for Internal Programs and Associate Dean for Research and Clinical Scholarship in the College of Nursing at the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center.

Before his tenure in academia, Dr. Miller held professorial positions at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and as Director of Clinical Nursing Research at the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland. Dr. Miller also worked as a clinical nurse in medical centers and hospitals in California, Arizona and Michigan. In addition, he served as a Family Nurse Practitioner in New Mexico, Delaware and the District of Columbia.

The American Association of Nurse Practitioners is a national professional membership organization representing 205,000 nurse practitioners nationally. Under Dr. Miller's tenure, AANP membership has grown to more than 57,000 members, making AANP the largest nurse practitioner organization in the world. Dr. Miller has helped lead nurse practitioners in transforming patient-centered health care and has made tremendous strides in ensuring that policy makers and the public understand the care that nurse practitioners provide to millions of Americans each year.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Miller on a successful term as President of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners and in thanking him for the excellent care he has and continues to provide to his patients and the nurse practitioner profession.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RE- LATED AGENCIES APPROPRIA- TIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. DINA TITUS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes:

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

As a Member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, I regularly speak with both VA medical professionals and patients about advances in care for our nation's heroes.

The limited research that has been allowed to be conducted has shown very promising results on the use of medical marijuana for the treatment of conditions such as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Nearly 1 of 5 veterans from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan is diagnosed with PTSD and we have seen a skyrocketing rate of overuse and addiction of powerful painkillers being used to treat such illnesses.

Giving medical professionals additional tools to treat these serious ailments is not just commonsense, it is the right thing to do.

Often times we hear elected officials come to the well of the House and speak about their commitment to our servicemembers and veterans. Today we have an opportunity to do more than offer platitudes, we can offer relief: relief from the pain and suffering associated with PTSD; relief from a medical system with little to offer as alternative treatments to powerful and addictive painkillers; relief from the fear of being penalized for using medical marijuana prescribed by a private doctor; and relief to VA medical professionals in the 36 states, including Nevada and Washington D.C. where medical marijuana is legal, allowing them to utilize their medical judgement to determine the best treatment options for their patients.

Forcing the 225,000 veterans who call Nevada home and millions across the country to go outside the VA health system to seek treatment, without the supervision and guidance of the medical professionals who understand the specific needs of our veteran community, is irresponsible.

I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan amendment and stand up for our brave men and women who bear the scars of war and who so desperately need our support.

REINTRODUCING DUWAMISH TRIBAL RECOGNITION ACT

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reintroduce the Duwamish Tribal Recognition

Act. This legislation addresses a longstanding issue that affects the indigenous people of Seattle's metropolitan area. This year marks the 160th year since the Duwamish Tribe signed the Point Elliott Treaty in 1855. In exchange for the reservation and other benefits including hunting and fishing rights promised in the Point Elliott Treaty by the United States government, the Duwamish Tribe ceded 54,000 acres of their homeland. Today, those 54,000 acres include the cities of Bellevue, Mercer Island, Renton, Seattle, Tukwila, and much of King County.

The Duwamish people's struggle for federal recognition continues. It was granted to them in 2001, but then denied under dubious circumstances after just eight months. On September 2001, George W. Bush's Interior Department's administration officials denied the recognition of the Duwamish Tribe. U.S. District Judge Coughenour vacated the administration's denial through statements expressing concern on how "plaintiffs should not be left to wonder why one administration thought their petition should be considered under both sets of rules, but a second one did not." I agree with Judge Coughenour.

It has been a long fight for federal recognition of the Duwamish people. During that time the Interior Department's rules for federal recognition of tribes have changed from the original regulations set in 1978 to those that were revised in 1994. There is significant evidence to support Duwamish recognition that is not included in the current record filed over twenty years ago.

I have asked the Secretary of the Interior, Sally Jewell, to look into this matter as I believe this bill will provide the federal recognition to which the Duwamish Tribe has long been entitled. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

RECOGNIZING LITTLE CAESARS LOVE KITCHEN'S 30 YEARS OF MAKING A DIFFERENCE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great Michigan family-owned company, Little Caesars Pizza, on a very special anniversary in that company's history and the two wonderful people who started and built that company, Mike and Marion Ilitch. 30 years ago today, on April 30, 1985, Mike and Marion Ilitch started the Little Caesars Love Kitchen, which over the years has provided free meals to nearly three million homeless, hungry and displaced families. Since it provided its first free meal, the Little Caesars big-rig pizza kitchen on wheels has traveled to all 48 states in the continental U.S. providing fresh, hot pizza for the hungry, homeless, victims of natural disasters and terrorist attacks in more than 4,000 American cities.

Mike and Marion Ilitch created the Love Kitchen as a way to demonstrate their deep commitment to helping those in need by giving back to the communities in which it does business. Meals from the Love Kitchen are completely free of charge for everyone served. Local Little Caesars franchise owners and company regional offices donate all the food

and labor costs that allows the Love Kitchen to assist those in need. The commitment to helping those in need extends far beyond the Ilitch family and evidence of that fact is that an estimated 50,000 Little Caesars franchise owners and employees have volunteered countless hours of their time over the years to support this program in their local communities. In addition to the local support and participation of franchisees, Little Caesars Enterprises contributes nationally and has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars per year to operate the program, including an investment of \$350,000 in 2014 to launch a second Love Kitchen allowing them to double the number of people they can help.

The Little Caesars Love Kitchen works with local shelters and community leaders across this nation every day to feed the hungry and homeless. When communities are struck by disasters, you can be nearly certain that the Love Kitchen will be rolling into town to provide relief to victims and rescue workers. Just a few of the many examples are that the Love Kitchen has fed families after devastating tornadoes in Oklahoma and Alabama, provided hot meals after Hurricane Sandy and Hurricane Katrina and helped feed rescue workers in the aftermath of the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center and the bombing of the Alfred Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City.

I commend Little Caesars founders Mike and Marion Ilitch, their entire family, and the many Little Caesars workers and franchisees for their unwavering commitment to supporting and comforting those in communities across this nation at times of greatest need. I also want to applaud the leadership of the President and CEO of Ilitch Holdings Christopher Ilitch and Little Caesars President and CEO Dave Scrivano for their important work to continue Little Caesars legacy as an outstanding corporate citizen. I salute the Little Caesars Love Kitchen on the occasion of its 30th anniversary and thank everyone at Little Caesars for spreading love, kindness, and hope in so many communities across our great nation.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, today, April 30th, marks the 40th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War. As Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to honor more than 58,000 American service men and women who lost their lives in the war, to honor the Vietnam veterans, and to honor the Vietnamese armed forces who fought alongside us to defend freedom, liberty, and democracy.

Their sacrifices will never be forgotten.

However, just as we remember those brave men and women, we should also recognize the millions of Vietnamese refugees that arrived in the United States following the fall of South Vietnam. Uprooted in a refugee crisis of enormous proportions, these Vietnamese have become an integral part of our society.

I take great pride in representing a part of Orange County's thriving Vietnamese-Amer-

ican community, and I have witnessed the community's growth over the years. Having represented "Little Saigon," I saw much of this growth up close.

I have seen the community grow not only economically but politically as well. Janet Nguyen—who as a five year old left Vietnam by boat—has risen to California State Senate in 2014. Her story of success exemplifies this generation of Vietnamese Americans.

I am sorry to say, however, that in the 40 years since the end of the Vietnam War, much work remains to be done. Political, religious and economic freedoms have been systematically squashed. This is a government that continues to deny citizens of Vietnam the right to change their government.

When I visited Vietnam, I saw firsthand the Communist Party's harassment of those Vietnamese citizens who decided to peacefully set forth dissenting political and religious views. When I met with the venerable Thich Quang Do and Le Quang Liem, I was immediately denounced by that Communist government.

The Vietnamese-American community has not lost sight of the struggle in their original homeland for freedom, for religious freedom, for freedom of speech, even for the right of young people to sit down in an Internet cafe and have a dialogue without censorship.

They are a part of this effort to make certain that those ideals stay alive so that in the same way that eastern Europe came to evolve into a democratic, market-oriented, tolerant society, that there will be that opportunity in the future for Vietnam.

SISTER ANN KEEFE POST OFFICE

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 2015

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sister Ann Keefe, who touched the lives of countless individuals in her service to Rhode Island, and in support of H.R. 651, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the "Sister Ann Keefe Post Office."

Sister Ann's generosity, compassion, and fearless advocacy for social justice have left an indelible mark on our state. She was a true public servant, speaking for those who had no voice and working tirelessly to assist the disadvantaged. In her more than 33 years of service as a Sister of Saint Joseph, Sister Ann worked to address the challenges facing Providence. No feat was too great; Sister Ann knew how to roll up her sleeves and get the job done, bringing a patient, faithful voice to issues affecting the most vulnerable among us.

Sister Ann's legacy endures through the many lives she touched and the dozens of initiatives and organizations she founded, including the Institute for the Study and Practice of Nonviolence, Providence CityArts for Youth, AIDS Care Ocean State, and the Providence Human Relations Commission. These programs continue to serve those in need and work to make our communities stronger.

Sister Ann faced the problems that others ignored, and her example serves as a reminder that with love, compassion, and determination, a single individual can make a tremendous difference. Sister Ann left us too soon, but our state and our world are better places because she passed through. I am proud to support the naming of this facility as yet another marker of appreciation for, and in remembrance of, Sister Ann, and I thank my good friend and colleague from Rhode Island for introducing this legislation.

RECOGNIZING APRAXIA
AWARENESS

HON. KEITH J. ROTHFUS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to Childhood Apraxia of Speech, a speech and communication disorder that causes extreme difficulty in learning to speak, which can affect literacy and school performance. Often times, children with Childhood Apraxia of Speech require frequent and aggressive speech therapy to improve their ability to communicate. Sadly, the cause of this disorder is unknown. More progress must be made to understand this complex condition.

Fortunately, the Childhood Apraxia of Speech Association located in Pittsburgh, PA continues to work tirelessly to raise awareness about this condition and to provide support to families of affected children. Thanks to their hard work, great strides have been made toward educating the public, as well as local, state, and federal officials.

Children with apraxia and their families confront tremendous obstacles with determination and persistence. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing these individuals on Apraxia Awareness Day this May and in thanking the Childhood Apraxia of Speech Association for their important contribution to our community.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM LEWIS
TROGDON

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 2015

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize William Lewis Trogdon, also known as William Least Heat-Moon, an author and native Missourian who was recently awarded for his Distinguished Literary Achievement by the Missouri Humanities Council.

The Missouri Humanities Council (MHC) promotes humanities education and engages the public in dialogue about important issues, bridging the gap between ideas and participatory democracy. Each year MHC recognizes Missouri authors producing exemplary literary works that make a significant contribution to our understanding and appreciation of Missouri's history and culture. Mr. Heat-Moon's body of work displays poignant accounts of traveling through rural America whether by car, boat, or foot with a particular emphasis on Missouri's local geography. His book *Blue Highways: A Journey Into America* records his trip through rural towns across 38 states, and was a New York Times Bestseller for 42 weeks.

As a former teacher, I understand the importance of arts and humanities education in shaping our understanding of history and culture. Again, I would like to congratulate Mr. Heat-Moon for his lifetime of literary achievements and his artistic contributions to the state of Missouri, and express my desire that other authors follow Mr. Heat-Moon's footsteps, exemplifying Missouri's culture in their literary and creative works.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND
VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RE-
LATED AGENCIES APPROPRIA-
TIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 29, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, today I rise in support of the over 180,000 brave veterans in Harris County, Texas who answered the call to duty when America needed them most and urge my colleagues to make much needed changes to the Military Construction-Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill that honor America's promise to all of our nation's veterans.

The MilCon-VA funding bill has traditionally been bipartisan and without controversy. Just last year MilCon passed the House by a margin of 416-1.

This year, unfortunately, this must-pass legislation fails to fully fund critical priorities for our veterans and the American people, including veterans' medical care and military and VA construction.

Nearly every major national Veteran Service Organizations, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion, agree and have called on the House to reconsider this legislation and fully fund the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Yesterday, the national commander of the VFW said that "the nationwide crisis in care and confidence that erupted in the VA last year was caused in many ways by the lack of adequate resourcing that only Congress is authorized to provide. That's why the VFW is demanding that the House amend this bill to appropriate a funding level that fully funds VA."

The national commander for the American Legion voiced similar feelings last week when he called for Congress and the White House to put political gamesmanship aside and fully fund Veterans Affairs.

Madam Chair, I do not recall ever voting against a VA funding bill. Unfortunately, as currently written I cannot vote for this bill and call on my colleagues to demand that the VA be fully funded.

The current funding shortfall for our veterans and military construction, which have always been supported by Democrats and Republicans, further highlights the pressing need for Congress to end the sequestration cuts. We simply cannot continue suffocating essential programs that support our servicemembers and veterans protect working families and our most vulnerable.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2543–S2592

Measures Introduced: Forty bills and eleven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1139–1178, S. Res. 156–165, and S. Con. Res. 14. **Pages S2567–68**

Measures Reported:

S. 993, to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1177, to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves. **Page S2566**

Measures Passed:

Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act: Senate passed S. 665, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received. **Pages S2587–89**

Silver Star Service Banner Day: Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 136, expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2015, as "Silver Star Service Banner Day", and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S2589**

Cultural and Historic Significance of the Cinco de Mayo Holiday: Senate agreed to S. Res. 158, recognizing the cultural and historic significance of the Cinco de Mayo holiday. **Page S2589**

National 9-1-1 Education Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 159, designating April 2015, as "National 9-1-1 Education Month". **Page S2589**

Public Service Recognition Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 160, expressing the sense of the Senate that public servants should be commended for their

dedication and continued service to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week. **Page S2589**

Financial Literacy Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 161, designating April 2015 as "Financial Literacy Month". **Page S2589**

Alcohol Responsibility Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 162, supporting the goals and ideals of Alcohol Responsibility Month. **Page S2589**

Earthquake in Nepal: Senate agreed to S. Res. 163, expressing the sense of the Senate on the humanitarian catastrophe caused by the April 25, 2015, earthquake in Nepal. **Page S2589**

Dia de los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans: Senate agreed to S. Res. 164, designating April 30, 2015, as Dia de los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans. **Page S2589**

World Malaria Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 165, supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day. **Page S2589**

Measures Considered:

Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 1191, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, taking action on the following amendments proposed there-to: **Pages S2545–49**

Pending:

Corker/Cardin Amendment No. 1140, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2545**

Corker/Cardin Amendment No. 1179 (to Amendment No. 1140), to require submission of all Persian text included in the agreement. **Page S2545**

Blunt Amendment No. 1155 (to Amendment No. 1140), to extend the requirement for annual Department of Defense reports on the military power of Iran. **Page S2545**

Vitter Modified Amendment No. 1186 (to Amendment No. 1179), to require an assessment of inadequacies in the international monitoring and

verification system as they relate to a nuclear agreement with Iran. **Page S2545**

Cotton Amendment No. 1197 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 1140), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2549**

Cotton (for Rubio) Amendment No. 1198 (to Amendment No. 1197), to require a certification that Iran's leaders have publically accepted Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state. **Page S2549**

Veto Messages:

National Labor Relations Board Veto Message—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures. **Pages S2549–59**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, May 4, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the veto message to accompany the joint resolution. **Page S2590**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to the United States Congress supporting the underlying objectives of the recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (the "Commission"); which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. (PM–15)

Pages S2564–65

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

22 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
20 Army nominations in the rank of general.
2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

5 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy. **Pages S2589–90, S2592**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Patricia Nelson Limerick, of Colorado, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2018.

Gayle Smith, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Julie Helene Becker, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Steven M. Wellner, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of

the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

William Ward Nooter, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Robert A. Salerno, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Todd Sunhwae Kim, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the term of fifteen years.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Pages S2590–92

Messages from the House: **Page S2565**

Measures Referred: **Page S2565**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2565–66**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S2566**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S2566–67**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2569–70**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2570–83**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2563–64**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2583–87**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2587**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:07 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, May 4, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2590.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2016 for the National Institutes of Health, after receiving testimony from Francis S. Collins, Director, Anthony Fauci, Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, Douglas Lowy, Acting Director, National Cancer Institute, Gary Gibbons, Director, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, Jon Lorsch, Director, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, and Tom Insel, Director, National Institute of Mental Health, all of the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Peter Levine, of Maryland, to be Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, and 361 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States European Command programs and budget in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Philip M. Breedlove, USAF, Commander, U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, Department of Defense.

INSURANCE CAPITAL RULES AND FSOC PROCESS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment concluded a hearing to examine insurance capital rules and Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC) process, including S. 798, to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength or when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation places a lien against an insurance company's assets, after receiving testimony from Robert M. Falzon, Prudential Financial, Newark, New Jersey, on behalf of the American Council of Life Insurers and the American Insurance Association; Kurt Bock, COUNTRY Financial, Bloomington, Illinois, on behalf of the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies and the Property Casualty Insurers Association of America; and Daniel Schwarcz, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 703, to reauthorize the weatherization and State energy programs, S. 720, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, S. 858, to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities, S. 523, to coordinate the provision of energy retrofitting assistance to schools, S. 600, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency retrofit pilot program, S. 723, to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide guidance on utility energy service contracts used by Federal agencies, S. 869, to improve energy performance in Federal buildings, S. 878, to establish a State residential building energy efficiency upgrades loan

pilot program, S. 886, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to provide for a smart energy and water efficiency pilot program, S. 888, to promote Federal-State partnerships for developing regional energy strategies and plans to mitigate risks in changing energy systems, S. 893, to establish an Energy Productivity Innovation Challenge (EPIC) to assist energy policy innovation in the States to promote the goal of doubling electric and thermal energy productivity by January 1, 2030, S. 939, to require the evaluation and consolidation of duplicative green building programs within the Department of Energy, S. 1029, to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the Secretary of Energy from prescribing a final rule amending the efficiency standards for residential non-weatherized gas furnaces or mobile home furnaces until an analysis has been completed, S. 1038, to clarify that no express or implied warranty is provided by reason of a disclosure relating to voluntary participation in the Energy Star program, S. 1039, to require certain agencies to conduct assessments of data centers and develop data center consolidation and optimization plans to achieve energy cost savings, S. 1044, to enhance consumer access to electricity information and allow for the adoption of innovative products and services to help consumers manage their energy usage, S. 1046, to accelerate the adoption of smart building technologies in the private sector and key Federal agencies, S. 1047, to require the Secretary of Energy to review rulemaking proceedings of other Federal agencies for the potential to cause an adverse effect on the cost, time, or difficulty of complying with energy efficiency regulations, guidelines, or standards, S. 1048, to remove the authority of the Secretary of Energy to amend or issue new energy efficiency standards for ceiling fans, S. 1052, to require a study on the impact of State and local performance benchmarking and disclosure policies for commercial and multifamily buildings, to provide for competitive awards to utilities, States, and units of local government, S. 1053, to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to promote alternative fueled vehicle fleets and infrastructure, and S. 1063, to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal energy efficiency resource standard for electricity and natural gas suppliers, after receiving testimony from Kathleen Hogan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy for Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; Gene Therriault, Alaska Energy Authority, Anchorage, on behalf of the National Association of State Energy Officials; Tony Crasi, The Crasi Company, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, on behalf of the National Association of Home Builders; and Ted Gayer, Brookings Institution, and Steven

Nadel, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, both of Washington, D.C.

HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining concluded a hearing to examine the Bureau of Land Management's final rule on hydraulic fracturing, after receiving testimony from Neil Kornze, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Mark Watson, Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission State Oil and Gas Supervisor, Casper; Bruce Baizel, Earthworks, Durango, Colorado; and Kathleen Sgamma, Western Energy Alliance, Denver, Colorado.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 993, to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 72 public bills, H.R. 2123–2194; and 7 resolutions, H. Res. 236–242 were introduced. **Pages H2766–72**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2772–73**

Reports Filed: A report was filed today as follows: H.J. Res. 43, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (H. Rept. 114–99); **Page H2766**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Carter (GA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2659**

Discharge Petition: Representative Heck (WA) presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Financial Services from the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1031, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes (Discharge Petition No. 1).

Recess: The House recessed at 11:21 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2668**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Michael Siegel, Anshe Emet Synagogue, Chicago, Illinois. **Page H2668**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 236 yeas to 175 nays with two answering "present", Roll No. 182. **Pages H2684–85**

Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds, the rotunda of the Capitol, and Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for official Congressional events surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol:

The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Con. Res. 43, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds, the rotunda of the Capitol, and Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for official Congressional events surrounding the visit of His Holiness Pope Francis to the United States Capitol. **Page H2685**

Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016: The House continued consideration of H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, May 1. **Pages H2685–94, H2710–27, H2742–64**

Agreed to:

Jackson Lee amendment that redirects \$1,000,000 in funding within the Departmental Administration account; **Pages H2692–94**

Fortenberry amendment that increases, by offset, funding for Defense Nuclear Non-Proliferation by \$13,802,000; **Pages H2712–14**

Langevin amendment that increases the funding for the Naval Reactor account by \$2,426,000 and reduces funding for the Federal Salaries and Expenses by \$2,500,000; **Pages H2715–19**

McKinley amendment that prohibits the use of the funds to transform the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close the National Energy Technology Laboratory;

Page H2719

Babin amendment (No. 3 printed in the Congressional Record of April 27, 2015) that prohibits the use of funds under the heading “Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation” from being made available to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that require the Islamic Republic of Iran to cease the pursuit, acquisition, and development of nuclear weapons technology; **Pages H2719–20**

Engel amendment (No. 7 printed in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2015) that prohibits the use of funds to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency’s fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum; **Pages H2722–23**

Dent amendment that prohibits the use of funds by the Department of Energy to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled “Standard Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits”; **Pages H2726–27**

Napolitano amendment that prohibits the use of funds in contravention of section 2101 of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (33 U.S.C. 2238b) or section 210 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986; **Page H2727**

Stivers amendment that prohibits the use of funds for the Cape Wind Energy Project on the Outer Continental Shelf off Massachusetts, Nantucket Sound; **Page H2727**

Burgess amendment that prohibits the use of funds to implement or enforce the standards established by tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps (by a recorded vote of 232 ayes and 189 noes, Roll No. 207); **Pages H2724–26, H2750–51**

Barton amendment that increases, by offset, funding for the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works by \$30,000,000; **Pages H2751–52**

Abraham amendment that prohibits the use of funds to implement Executive Order 13690 and Federal Flood Risk Management Standard; **Pages H2752–53**

Jackson Lee amendment that prohibits the use of funds in contravention of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.); **Pages H2753–54**

DelBene amendment that prohibits the use of funds for the purchase of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are procured from a manufacturer that is part of the national technology and industrial base; **Pages H2755–56**

Gosar amendment that prohibits the use of funds for the removal of any Federally owned or operated dam; **Page H2756**

Grayson amendment that prohibits the use of funds to enter into contracts with individuals convicted of fraud; **Pages H2756–57**

Blackburn amendment (No. 13 printed in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2015) that prohibits the use of funds to finalize, promulgate, or enforce the DOE’s proposed rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Furnaces”; and **Page H2759**

Luetkemeyer amendment (No. 16 printed in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2015) that prohibits the use of funds for the Missouri River Ecosystem Restoration Program (MRERP). **Page H2761**

Rejected:

Heck (NV) amendment that sought to increase funding for Nuclear Energy by \$75,000,000 and to zero out funding for Nuclear Waste Disposal; **Page H2686**

Titus amendment that sought to reduce funding for Nuclear Waste Disposal by \$150,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account; **Pages H2689–91**

Garamendi amendment that sought to reduce funds for Defense Nuclear Non-Proliferation by \$125,000,000 and increase funds for Environmental and other Defense activities, Defense Environmental clean up by the same amount; **Pages H2714–15**

McClintock amendment that sought to reduce funding for sundry accounts and to apply the aggregate savings of \$128,920,000 to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 126 ayes to 295 noes, Roll No. 195); **Page H2743**

Ruiz amendment that sought to increase funding for Water and Related Resources by \$5,000,000 and to reduce funding for Fossil Energy Research and Development by \$2,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 249 noes, Roll No. 196); **Pages H2743–44**

Griffith amendment that sought to increase funding for Fossil Energy Research and Development by \$5,000,000 and to reduce funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by a similar amount (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 197); **Page H2744**

Swalwell (CA) amendment that sought to increase funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by \$25,500,000 and to reduce funding for Fossil Energy by \$34,000,000 (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 198); **Pages H2744–45**

Byrne amendment that sought to zero out funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and to apply the savings of \$1,657,774,000 to the spending

reduction account (by a recorded vote of 139 ayes to 282 noes, Roll No. 199); **Pages H2745–46**

McClintock amendment that sought to zero out funding for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, reduce Nuclear Energy by \$691,886,000, and zero out funding for Fossil Energy and to apply the aggregate savings of \$2,954,660,000 to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 110 ayes to 311 noes, Roll No. 200); **Page H2746**

Ellison amendment that sought to reduce funding for Fossil Energy Research and Development by \$45,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 175 ayes to 246 noes, Roll No. 201); **Pages H2686–88, H2746–47**

Swalwell (CA) amendment that sought to increase funding for Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy (ARPA-E) by \$20,000,000 and reduce funding for Departmental Administration by a similar amount (by a recorded vote of 202 ayes to 219 noes, Roll No. 202); **Pages H2691–92, H2747–48**

Quigley amendment that sought to apply \$167,050,000 to the savings reduction account for the new nuclear arm cruise missile (by a recorded vote of 164 ayes to 257 noes, Roll No. 203); **Pages H2711, H2748**

Garamendi amendment that sought to reduce the Atomic Energy Defense Activities National Nuclear Security Administration, Weapons Activities Account by \$25,000,000 and apply the savings to the spending reduction account (by a recorded vote of 149 ayes to 272 noes, Roll No. 204); **Pages H2711–12, H2748–49**

Hudson amendment that sought to reduce funds in the bill by 11.1208 percent except for National Nuclear Security Administration, Environmental and Defense Activities, and Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (by a recorded vote of 143 ayes to 278 noes, Roll No. 205); **Pages H2721–22, H2749–50**

Sanford amendment that sought to zero out the funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program and to prohibit the use of funds to provide a loan under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 206); and **Pages H2723–24, H2750**

Castro amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds in excess of \$276,117,000 for additional funding for ongoing work on Flood and Storm Damage Reduction projects. **Pages H2757–59**

Withdrawn:

Flores amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding for Science by \$2,500,000 and reduced funding for Salaries and Expenses of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by \$25,000,000; and **Page H2688**

Foster amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have increased funding for Science Activities by \$239,749,000 and reduced funding for National Nuclear Security Weapons Activities by a similar amount. **Pages H2688–89**

Point of Order sustained against:

Babin amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of April 27, 2015) that sought to prohibit the use of funds under the heading “Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation” from being used to enter into new contracts with, or new agreements for Federal assistance to the Islamic Republic of Iran except for contracts or agreements that include authority for the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct anytime, anywhere inspections of civil and military sites within the Islamic Republic of Iran; and **Pages H2720–21**

Cleaver amendment that sought to provide that total project costs in section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 shall not apply with respect to any project that receives funds made available by title I of this Act. **Page H2724**

Proceedings Postponed:

Rothfus (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2015) that seeks to prohibit use of funds to apply the report entitled “Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas from the United States” in any public interest determination under the Natural Gas Act; **Pages H2754–55**

Gosar (No. 10 printed in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2015) that seeks to prohibit the use of funds for the Department of Energy’s Climate Model Development and Validation program; **Page H2757**

Blackburn (No. 12 printed in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2015) that seeks to reduce funding in the bill by 1 percent across-the-board; **Pages H2759–61**

McClintock that seeks to prohibit the use of funds for the purchase of water to supplement or enhance instream water flow requirements in California; **Pages H2761–62**

LaMalfa that seeks to prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce the requirement in the Code of Federal Regulations, that activities identified in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act must be established or ongoing in order to receive an exemption under the Act; and **Pages H2762–63**

LaMalfa that seeks to prohibit use of funds to deliver water to the Trinity River above the minimum requirements of the Trinity Record of Decision or to supplement flows in the Klamath River. **Pages H2763–64**

H. Res. 223, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2028) and (H.R. 2029) was agreed to yesterday, April 29th.

Recess: The House recessed at 5:26 p.m. and reconvened at 5:40 p.m. **Page H2702**

Congressional Budget Resolution FY 2016: The House agreed to the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 226 yeas to 197 nays, Roll No. 183. **Pages H2761–84, H2694–H2702**

H. Res. 231, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732), the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 242 yeas to 181 noes, Roll No. 181, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 241 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 180. **Pages H2683–84**

A point of order was raised against the consideration of H. Res. 231 and it was agreed to proceed with consideration of the resolution by a yeas-and-nays vote of 240 yeas 174 nays, Roll No. 179.

Pages H2672–74

Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016: The House passed H.R. 2029, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 255 yeas to 163 nays, Roll No. 193. Consideration began yesterday, April 29th. **Pages H2702–10**

Rejected the Kirkpatrick motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 181 yeas to 236 noes, Roll No. 192. **Pages H2708–10**
Rejected:

Van Hollen amendment that was debated on April 29th that sought to strike the pending paragraph pertaining to the Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps (by a recorded vote of 191 yeas to 229 noes with one answering “present”, Roll No. 184); **Page H2703**

Mulvaney amendment that was debated on April 29th that sought to strike the pending paragraph pertaining to the Military Construction, Air Force (by a recorded vote of 192 yeas to 229 noes with one answering “present”, Roll No. 185); **Pages H2703–04**

Mulvaney amendment that was debated on April 29th that sought to strike the pending paragraph pertaining to the Military Construction, Defense-

Wide (by a recorded vote of 190 yeas to 231 noes with one answering “present”, Roll No. 186);

Pages H2704–05

Nadler amendment that was debated on April 29th that sought to strike section 512 from the bill pertaining to the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (by a recorded vote of 167 yeas to 254 noes, Roll No. 187); **Page H2705**

Blumenauer amendment that was debated on April 29th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce Veterans Health Administration directive 2011–004 with respect to the prohibition on “VA providers for completing forms seeking recommendations or opinions regarding a Veteran’s participation in a State marijuana program” (by a recorded vote of 210 yeas to 213 noes, Roll No. 188); **Pages H2705–06**

Pocan amendment that was debated on April 29th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term “Fair Labor Standards Act” (by a recorded vote of 186 yeas to 237 noes, Roll No. 189); **Pages H2706–07**

Hice (GA) amendment that was debated on April 29th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to pay a Federal Employee for any period of time during which such employee is using official time under U.S. Code (by a recorded vote of 190 yeas to 232 noes, Roll No. 190); and **Page H2707**

King (IA) amendment (No. 3 printed in the Congressional Record of April 28, 2015) that was debated on April 29th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce the prevailing wage requirements under what is commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act (by a recorded vote of 186 yeas to 235 noes, Roll No. 191).

Pages H2707–08

H. Res. 223, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2028) and (H.R. 2029) was agreed to yesterday, April 29th.

Disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014: The House passed H.J. Res. 43, disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 228 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 194.

Pages H2727–42

H. Res. 231, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732), the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 242 yeas to 181 noes, Roll No.

181, after the previous question was ordered by a ye-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 180.

Pages H2683–84

A point of order was raised against the consideration of H. Res. 231 and it was agreed to proceed with consideration of the resolution by a ye-and-nay vote of 240 yeas 174 nays, Roll No. 179.

Pages H2672–74

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress of the recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission—referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 114–30).

Page H2765

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five ye-and-nay votes and 23 recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2673–74, H2683–84, H2684, H2702, H2703, H2703–04, H2704–05, H2705, H2705–06, H2706–07, H2707, H2707–08, H2709–10, H2710, H2742, H2743, H2743–44, H2744, H2744–45, H2745–46, H2746, H2747, H2747–48, H2748, H2748–49, H2749–50, H2750 and H2750–51. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 1:48 a.m. on Friday, May 1st.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2088, the “United States Grains Standards Act Reauthorization Act of 2015”; and H.R. 2051, the “Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015”. H.R. 2051 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 2088 was ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for FY 2016. The Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for FY 2016 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 1735, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016”. H.R. 1735 was ordered reported, as amended.

IMPROVING COLLEGE ACCESS AND COMPLETION FOR LOW-INCOME AND FIRST-GENERATION STUDENTS

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce

Training held a hearing entitled “Improving College Access and Completion for Low-Income and First-Generation Students”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON 21ST CENTURY CURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Legislative Hearing on 21st Century Cures”. Testimony was heard from Kathy Hudson, Deputy Director for Science, Outreach, and Policy, National Institutes of Health; Janet Woodcock, Director of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration; and Jeff Shuren, Director of the Center for Devices and Radiological Health, Food and Drug Administration.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE DISCUSSION DRAFT AND TITLE IV ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing entitled “Strategic Petroleum Reserve Discussion Draft and Title IV Energy Efficiency”. Testimony was heard from Christopher A. Smith, Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

FCC REAUTHORIZATION: IMPROVING COMMISSION TRANSPARENCY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing entitled “FCC Reauthorization: Improving Commission Transparency”. Testimony was heard from Tom Wheeler, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Mike O’Rielly, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

REGIONAL IMPACT OF U.S. POLICY TOWARDS IRAQ AND SYRIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled “Regional Impact of U.S. Policy Towards Iraq and Syria”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BANGLADESH’S FRACTURE: POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS EXTREMISM

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled “Bangladesh’s Fracture: Political and Religious Extremism”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MIGRATION CRISIS: OVERSIGHT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED \$1 BILLION REQUEST FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing entitled "Migration Crisis: Oversight of the Administration's Proposed \$1 Billion Request for Central America". Testimony was heard from Scott Hamilton, Central America Director, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; William R. Brownfield, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State; Paloma Adams-Allen, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Latin America and the Caribbean Bureau, U.S. Agency for International Development; Alan D. Bersin, Assistant Secretary and Chief Diplomatic Officer, Office of Policy, Department of Homeland Security; and Lieutenant General Kenneth E. Tovo, USA, Military Deputy Commander, U.S. Southern Command, Department of Defense.

ALLEGATIONS OF SPECIAL ACCESS AND POLITICAL INFLUENCE AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Allegations of Special Access and Political Influence at the Department of Homeland Security". Testimony was heard from Alejandro Mayorkas, Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

A REVIEW OF ACCESS CONTROL MEASURES AT OUR NATION'S AIRPORTS, PART II

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled "A Review of Access Control Measures at Our Nation's Airports, Part II". Testimony was heard from Melvin Carraway, Acting Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2048, the "USA FREEDOM Act of 2015". H.R. 2048 was ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 774, the "Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2015"; H.R. 1214, the "National Forest Small Tracts Act Amendments Act of 2015"; H.R. 1335, the "Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act"; and H.R. 1991, the "Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act Extension Act of 2015". The fol-

lowing bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 774, H.R. 1214, and H.R. 1335. The following bill was ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 1991.

EPA MISMANAGEMENT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "EPA Mismanagement". Testimony was heard from the following Environmental Protection Agency officials: Arthur Elkins, Inspector General, Office of Inspector General; Patrick Sullivan, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, Office of Inspector General; Stanley Meiburg, Acting Deputy Administrator; and John Reeder, Deputy Chief of Staff.

EXAMINING THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK'S MANDATES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules; and the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade of the Committee on Financial Services, held a joint hearing entitled "Examining the Export-Import Bank's Mandates". Testimony was heard from Fred Hochberg, Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank of the United States.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2039, the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for 2016 and 2017". H.R. 2039 was ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1987, the "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015"; H.R. 1642, to designate the building utilized as a United States courthouse located at 150 Reade Circle in Greenville, North Carolina, as the "Randy D. Doub United States Courthouse"; and General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions. H.R. 1987 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 1642 and the General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions were ordered reported, without amendment.

BUSINESS MEETING; EXAMINING ACCESS AND QUALITY OF CARE AND SERVICES FOR WOMEN VETERANS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a business meeting to consider a motion to issue a subpoena to the Department of Veterans Affairs, to

produce complete MSPB and EEO files from the Regional Office in Philadelphia to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and a hearing entitled "Examining Access and Quality of Care and Services for Women Veterans". A motion that the Committee authorize the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum to Robert A. McDonald, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, for the Department of Veterans Affairs to produce complete copies of all Merit Systems Protection Board and Equal Employment Opportunity files of the Philadelphia Regional Benefit Office from December 31, 2008, to present was adopted. Testimony was heard from Patricia Hayes, Chief Consultant for Women's Health Services, Office of Patient Care Services, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

**NEXT STEPS FOR WELFARE REFORM:
IDEAS TO IMPROVE TEMPORARY
ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES TO
HELP MORE FAMILIES FIND WORK AND
ESCAPE POVERTY**

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing entitled "Next Steps for Welfare Reform: Ideas to Improve Temporary Assistance for Needy Families to Help More Families Find Work and Escape Poverty". Testimony was heard from Eloise Anderson, Co-Chair of the Secretaries' Innovation Group, Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 1, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "What is the Federal Government Doing to Combat the Opioid Abuse Epidemic?", 9 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Examining Microbeads in Cosmetic Products", 9:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled "Oversight of the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority", 9:15 a.m., HVC-210.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, hearing on H.J. Res. 45, the "Victims' Rights Amendment", 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled "Is the Railroad Retirement Board Doing Enough to Protect Against Fraud?", 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled "Innovations in Battery Storage for Renewable Energy", 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, May 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 8, National Labor Relations Board, with a vote on or in relation to the veto message to accompany the joint resolution expected at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, May 1

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 2028—Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 2016. Consideration of H.R. 1732—Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Boehner, John A., Ohio, E623
Carter, Earl L. "Buddy", Ga., E628, E631, E633
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E625
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E635
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E631
Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E627
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E623
Dold, Robert J., Ill., E631
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E629
Foster, Bill, Ill., E629, E630
Gibson, Christopher P., N.Y., E633
Gohmert, Louie, Tex., E627
Green, Gene, Tex., E638
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E638
Honda, Michael M., Calif., E626

Kato, John, N.Y., E623, E626
Keating, William R., Mass., E629
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E624
Langevin, James R., R.I., E637
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E626
Lynch, Stephen F., Mass., E628
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E627
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E635, E636
Meehan, Patrick, Pa., E626
Miller, Candice S., Mich., E637
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E624
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E631
Nunes, Devin, Calif., E633
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E632
Perry, Scott, Pa., E635
Reichert, David G., Wash., E632
Rothfus, Keith J., Pa., E638

Royce, Edward R., Calif., E637
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E627
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E629
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E624
Smith, Adam, Wash., E628, E629, E630, E631, E633
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E634
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E630
Thornberry, Mac, Tex., E635
Titus, Dina, Nev., E636
Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E632
Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E636
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E624, E625
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E623
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E632
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E626
Young, David, Iowa, E630



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.